

Nehru Literature Series No. 4.

THE GREAT IDEALS OF JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

by
Prof. T. K. Dutt, M. A. (Cal. & Dac.)

Former Senator of Agra University.



NEHRU FOUNDATION,
224/4, PREM NAGAR,
GURDASPUR (Pb.)

Published by :—

Jaswant Singh,

Secretary,

NEHRU FOUNDATION,

224/4, Prem Nagar, Gurdaspur. (Pb.)

No one is permitted to print, publish, reproduce or translate
any part of this book without the written permission
of the Nehru Foundation

All Rights Reserved with Nehru Foundation

[Price : **Rs. 8-00**]

073.254
D 75 G

Printed by :—

Chaman Lal Bansal,

at Lalima Printers,

Nicholson Road,

AMBALA CANTT.

FOREWORD

A WARNING TO THE WORLD

translate
ion

The world is heading, not to a nuclear war, but a series of devastating wars in various parts of the world. We are not political prophets, but we can, with sufficient certainty, warn all the world nations that sooner or later Europe, South America, India, China, Pakistan, Japan, Russia and the islands in the Pacific and particularly, the various States of Africa will flare up into a mighty conflagration that may consume and devastate a considerable portion of the human population which will exceed the figure of six thousand million by the end of the present century. The United Nations, and not the Commonwealth of Nations, can probably save the world from

this great conflagration, provided America and Britain give up altogether their ambitious programmes of acquiring further power and supremacy in all corners of the world, provided China grows more sober and less barbarous, and also gives up altogether her biggest hoax of Communism, and provided also Russia comes back to the high ideal of human welfare and human culture which India has been preaching for ages, particularly, during the Upanisadic period of Indian culture and Indian philosophy, for which, we are sure, not only Russia but all the nations of the world should have the highest regard. We can predict with as much certainty that there shall be no nuclear war even in the remotest future, and therefore, we would advise the nuclear nations, not to pursue any longer the foolish game of piling up the nuclear weapons, but to devote all their resources to the advancement of human knowledge as Russia and America have been doing sometimes in the nuclear field for the service of humanity.

24th December, 1965.

T. K DUTT

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

National Integration

1. Significance of National Integration	1
2. Obstacles in the way of National Integration	2
3. How National Integration is Possible	3

CHAPTER II

Social Justice

1. What is Social Justice.	12
2. How can Social Justice be maintained ?	14
3. Feudalism and Capitalism must go.	15
4. Dignity of Labour	18
5. No Favouritism or Nepotism	19
6. Equality between Man and Woman	20
7. Co-operative and inter-dependent Life	22
8. Recognition of the Common Man	23
9. State Ownership of Land and Capital	25

CHAPTER III

Secularism

1. What does Secularism mean ?	28
2. The basis of morality should be non-religious	29
3. Policy of excluding Religious Teaching from Educational Institutions under State Control	31
4. No Favouritism or Communal, Sectarian or Class-Basis.	32

5.	Universal Religious Toleration	35
5.	Equal Franchise	35

CHAPTER IV

Scientific Approach to Problems

1.	What does Scientific Approach mean ?	...	37
2.	What are the Ways of Scientific Approach ?	...	39
3.	Consideration of National Interest in terms of Human Welfare	...	40
4.	Practical Way of Looking at Things	...	41
5.	We must march with the times.	...	42
6.	Mutual Adjustment and Co-operation	...	44

CHAPTER V

International Understanding

1.	No Narrow or Orthodox Nationalism	...	48
2.	Understanding of Human Relations	...	50
3.	Co-operation between Nations	...	52
4.	Avoidance of Armed Conflicts	...	54
5.	Exchange of Cultural Thoughts between Nations	...	57
6.	Settlement of International Disputes by a Representative World Government	...	57

CHAPTER VI

Democratic Way of Life

1.	What is Democracy ?	...	65
2.	No Dictatorship, No Autocracy	...	66
3.	Freedom of the Press, Speech and Action	...	68
4.	Government by Parliament and Legislative		

Assemblies or Councils	69
5. No more of Feudalism, Favouritism, Nepotism and Corruption	71

CHAPTER VII

Non-alignment

1. What is Non-alignment ?	76
2. The Benefits of Non-alignment	78
3. Is Non-alignment Practicable ?	81

CHAPTER VIII

Co-existence

1. What is Co-existence ?	85
2. Is Co-existence possible without any interference with other countries ?	87
3. How far Non-alignment is allied to co-existence ?	89
4. How Non-alignment and Co-existence are helpful to World Unity and World Peace ?	92

CHAPTER IX

1. How best Nehru's great ideals can be followed.	98
---	----

— — — — —

CHAPTER I

NATIONAL INTEGRATION

Significance of National Integration :

National Integration means national unity without which no national existence, no national strength, no national progress, no national prosperity, no national welfare is possible. In the context of the presentday conflicts in the human world, it is not possible for any nation or country to maintain its existence particularly when all nations and all countries are vieing with one another not to emulate any of the virtues for the uplift or welfare of humanity but to dominate, enslave and exploit the weaker nations and countries. We talk of internationalism, world federation, world unity, world harmony or peace but that is all on our lips or on paper; but behind all the so-called organisations or federations in the name of world peace or harmony there is always the point of the dagger or the muzzle of the gun or the more formidable nuclear weapon to blow up in a moment not merely certain cities or towns but practically the entire human race. After two great devastating wars in the past, everybody should have learnt the lesson that without universal love and brotherhood, without non-violence and coexistence it is not possible for any nation to survive in the face of such an international conspiracy of some of the bigger nations or countries that have developed into nuclear powers and that have grown, on that account, extremely greedy of power, wealth and exploitation. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, like all other great leaders, had seen how without national unity or integration it is impossible to maintain one's existence these days ; and that is why, immediately after the attainment of our political independence, he concentrated all his thought and energy on the problem of national integration. We remember how India was divided or partitioned by the Britishers on the communal basis simply because they wanted the seed of communal hatred to develop further even after the partition and thereby to slowly and gradually to eat into the very vitals of the two countries—India and Pakistan. Pandit Nehru stressed the point of national

integration with the greatest urgency and emphasis particularly when China struck India in 1962 when our country was divided on various pretexts and in various spheres, which was indeed very dangerous particularly at a moment when there was foreign aggression on our country. Nehru knew quite well that without national integration India could never face the Chinese armed forces, nor could she face even the aggression of Pakistan in Jammu and Kashmir. We realised for the first time during these two critical occasions how national integration is necessary, valuable and imperative.

Obstacles in the way of National Integration :

India is such a vast country or rather a sub-continent with a population of about five hundred million souls speaking so many languages, preaching so many religions, belonging to so many sects or communities, observing so many castes and having so many races ; and on top of all, there are so many autonomous States as they have in America or in Russia. We have got in India Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Parsees, Anglo-Indians, Eurasians, Buddhists, Jains, Christians, scattered all over the various States of our great sub-continent. Most of these races, sects or communities have different views, notions, attitudes, ideologies in matters of religion, language, education, politics and practically in every sphere of thought and activity. Even the various States are autonomous, and consequently, there is often much of differences between them in certain vital issues or problems. It is, therefore, not an easy job to bring about or maintain national integration in the face of such a heterogeneous mixture of men and things. India during the British rule used to be constantly torn between the Hindus and the Muslims ; and even after Independence she has been torn several times by her communal and linguistic problems. The ugliest feature about the Hindu community is its problem of untouchability which has actually separated quite a good lot of our population from the other section which consists of the superior castes such as the Brahmin's and the Kshatriyas and who in the eyes of the depressed classes or the untouchables are as foul tyrants, dictators and exploiters as the Britishers were to the Indians. Religion is a very delicate thing about which even the highly educated people are most sensitive, not to speak of

the illiterate or the half-educated section of the population. Even in the matter of language every body seems to be quite orthodox or conservative. We have been watching for the last two decades how even the Hindus have been bitterly fighting among themselves ever since Hindi has been declared as the national language of India. Sometimes even the various States of our Republic quarrel one another whenever there is any question of a special award in finance, food, technical education etc; in favour of any particular State.

How National Integration is possible :

The Britishers, so long they ruled over India, always tried to foment all sorts of enmity, strife, hatred, misunderstanding among the people by creating communal riots, by setting one sect against another, and even by showing all sorts of favouritism and nepotism to certain sections of the population so that there could be no unity or peace or harmony in the country. Divide and rule was their cardinal principle or policy behind their method of administration. When they quitted India they left behind them so many Native States that would have produced a mighty conflagration in our country had not the wisdom of Nehru and Patel tackled the problem very cautiously and successfully.

It was for national integration that Mahatma Gandhi wanted some Indian language to be the national language of our Country so that through this common language the various races, sects, communities and even the various States of India could communicate with one another and thereby have a proper understanding without which no mutual co-operation is possible. Neither Mahatma Gandhi nor Pandit Nehru wanted any foreign language to be the national language or even the common language or the *lingua franca* of our country. They discovered that Hindi is spoken and understood very widely all over India except in the Southern States where the native languages are Tamil, Telegu, Malayalam, Kanarese. South India alone protested heavily against the acknowledgment of Hindi as the link language of India. This protest led to much of agitation throughout the Southern parts of our sub-continent with the result that Nehru declared with the approval of the Parliament that English also should remain as the associate language of

our country till the non-Hindi-speaking States are able to pick up the Hindi language. Language is indeed the greatest means of bringing about a proper understanding between countries, races and nations of the world, and it is through the medium of a common language that the human race can probably come to some kind of world unity or world harmony. That is why, Pandit Nehru recommended the cultivation of Hindi for internal understanding and harmony, and the learning of the English language, which is the most widely spoken or understood language in the world, for the purpose of international understanding, co-operation and peace.

Next to language, Pandit Nehru considered religion as the greatest obstacle in the way of national integration. The Britishers knew this quite well, and that is why, they always inflamed the religious question of the two major communities in our country by instigating the Muslims to slaughter cows before Hindu temples and inciting the Hindus to have music before mosques at the time of prayer. The Britishers also tried to create splits between the Shia Muslims and the Sunni Muslims in order further to sub-divide our country. They always helped to infuse into our population all sorts of sectarian and communal prejudice, hatred and enmity as the result of which there was always some kind of disruption, disunion and chaos in our country during the British rule. Both Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru considered the question of religion as the most delicate problem which they tackled very cautiously by insisting on religious toleration and by declaring our country as a Secular State. Even then sometimes, some of the orthodox religious fanatics of our country try to raise the religious question and produce political disturbances particularly between the two major Communities—the Hindus and the Muslims. That is why, Pandit Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi had been very very particular about religious toleration, secularism, and all possible means of liberalising the common mind on the religious question.

But we Hindus or Muslims are so orthodox about our religious faiths or views or sentiments that we often insist on attaching some Muslim or Hindu name to our educational institutions such as Aligarh Muslim University, Banaras Hindu

University, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College or School, Kshatrya College or School. Even the Christian community in our country is no less orthodox than the Hindu or the Muslim community because we find so many educational institutions in our country named after certain Christian Saints such as St. Paul's College, St. Francis School, Loreto Convent School etc. The Muslim Community loves to brand their educational institutions with the name of 'Islamia' School or College or University. Then again, each of the communities in India, whether Hindu or Muslim or Christian, invariably tries to have its own religious teachings in the various educational institutions although no educational institution in our country holds exclusively on its roll students or teachers professing one religion only, either Hinduism, Islam or Christianity. Naturally when the Bible, the Koran or the Gita is being taught in the classes, some of the orthodox students or teachers may object to such kinds of religious instructions against their respective individual religious faith, and may create some kind of sectarian or communal feeling among themselves, which surely helps to contribute to our national disintegration. Mahatma Gandhi was an orthodox Hindu, while Pandit Nehru was believer in every kind of religion, although he was born in a Hindu family and brought up in a Christian atmosphere in England. Gandhi was also greatly influenced by the Bible and the Koran, and that is why, he used to equate Allah with Rama, and Jesus Christ with any of the great Hindu Gods.

Then again, formerly (if not now-a-days) we used to notice that hotels, restaurants, boarding-houses or other public rest-houses or eating-places used to be classified under sectarian or communal names. For example, the orthodox Hindus would never drink water from the Muslim hydrants or take tea or eat anything at any Muslim stalls or restaurants or hotels. Ofcourse, there is no such restriction in eating or drinking among the Muslims and the Christians; but then, unfortunately, two or three decades ago, the Muslims were not permitted to eat or lodge in any of the Hindu restaurants or hotels. The Britishers most mischievously used to have separate Hindu and Muslim hydrants, tea-stalls, and eating-places at every railway station of our country. But now-a-days, due to years of strenuous efforts on the part of Gandhi and Nehru much of the

religious orthodoxy or communal or sectarian fanaticism has died away; and that is why, after the political independence of India, we have learnt to be far more liberal than we ever were during the British rule in India. Ofcourse, science and industries, and international contact and communication are mainly responsible for the liberalisation of our religious views and thoughts, prejudices and fanaticisms.

More than anybody else in India, Pandit Nehru believed in cultural exchange between the races and the religions of the world. He himself had found a great benefit from such cultural contacts with the various races and nationalities of the world. It is a fact that a well-travelled man, who has come in touch with many people and various races, who has also studied the various scriptures of the world, and who has further lived mostly with other people than of his own country, as Pandit Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi did, is bound to rise above all sorts of limitations, prejudices, and narrownesses in every sphere of thought and action. Pandit Nehru never called himself a Hindu or a Christian or a Muslim, and that is why, probably he could freely dine and live with all the three major communities, and that is why also he was so liberal, impartial and sympathetic to all the sects and communities in India. Mahatma Gandhi, in this particular respect, was more free with the various sects and communities, and that is why, during the bitterest communal riots at Calcutta, Noakhali and else where, he could trust himself to the hands of the Muslims when he was a Hindu chiefly because he followed the teachings of the Gita, the Bible and the Koran with the fullest respects to all the three scriptures of the Hindus, the Christians and the Muslims. The caste system of the Hindus is the greatest obstacle in the way of national integration. Just consider how the Brahmins are separated from the Kshatriyas, how both these two 'superior' castes are separated from the Vaisyas and Sudras; and further, how all these four castes are separated from the vast majority of the Indian population that has been branded as the depressed classes or the untouchables. Can any body in the modern world of light and culture imagine how certain caste people call themselves as superior human beings to other human beings who have been branded by the same Hindu society as outcasts or untouchables who consist mainly

of the carpenters, the blacksmiths, the weavers, the shoemakers, the scavengers, the washermen and many other members of the same Hindu community who probably do much better and greater service to their country than the so-called superior castes of the Hindus such as the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas and even the Vaisyas and the Sudras who also contribute something to the service of their country by way of cultivation of the land and producing food for the millions. The Brahmins claim superiority on account of their learning and scholarship which unfortunately most of the Brahmins do not possess now-a-days. The original Brahmin race has degenerated into a race of professional Cooks at home, professional marriage-priests or professional priests in the temples or even as *Pandas* (not pandits) at the various places of pilgrimage where they tempt the stupid superstitious pilgrims only to fleece and betray them. The Kshatriyas, who claimed to be the next superior caste to the Brahmins, and who were originally entrusted with the duty of defence of country have now dwindled into an emasculated race of idlers, very few of whom can claim now-a-days their original heroic spirit—the spirit of self-sacrifice for the noble cause of freedom or of patriotism or love for their country. The Brahmins who were originally great scholars of learnings because formerly they used to monopolise the study of the *Vedas* and the *Upanisads* or rather the learned philosophies of our country, have now lost all their intellectual powers and have degenerated into a race of bankrupt brains because the so-called lower castes of the Hindus, by dint of labour and study, have developed their brains and intellectual powers to such a degree that in all fields of scholarship and learning, they have pushed the Brahmins into the background just as they have also taken the place of the Kshatriyas in all activities of physical strength and prowess.

Mahatma Gandhi, during the later part of his life fought tooth and nail against the most mischievous, mean and inhuman system of the Hindu society that segregated one-third of her population from the rest of it (population), and deprived it of all the rights and privileges which should be the birth-rights of every human being. The superior castes of the Hindus used to hate so much the depressed classes, who were no worse than the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas, that the untouchables

were not permitted to draw water from the same well, enter any of the Hindu temples, could not read in the same schools or colleges or even could not pass through the same streets or roads (particularly in South India) through which the superior castes used to pass. The untouchables or the *Pariahs* used to ring some bell in the streets while passing through them so that the Brahmins and other superior castes could come to know of the presence of the Pariahs and thereby avoid treading even their shadows. It is for this particular reason that the Pariahs used to be branded with the name of untouchables. Gandhi, in order to set an example before the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas used to live with the sweepers, scavengers and other untouchables and eat their food in the same vessels sitting with them on the ground. Gandhi used to say, "If we segregate one third of our precious population and treat them as untouchables, how can we expect to grow strong." While championing the cause of women he used to say in the same tone to the male population of our country, "If we shut out half of our population by locking them up within the four walls of our houses, if we deprive them of the light of education and culture, if we do not grant them the right of vote, our nation will remain for ever crippled."

Pandit Nahru, being a very staunch follower of Gandhi, and also himself being a very highly cultured man took every measure to lift the ban of untouchability from the depressed classes of the Hindus by giving them equal rights and privileges along with all other castes in the matter of education, in the right of worship in the temples, and even in the matter of appointments in the various services. It was, of course, Dr. Ambedkar who represented the untouchables and through whom or rather with whose help both Gandhi and his disciple Nehru succeeded in liberating the untouchables from the tyranny of the most wicked and pernicious system of the Hindu Society that boasts so much of the blood of aristocracy, the pride of scholarship and learning, and even of the highest philosophy and culture in the world.

Gandhi and Nehru not only destroyed the citadel of caste but also removed the prejudice against intercaste or inter-racial or even international marriage. Nehru used to say, "Woman is the chief connecting link between the individual members of

a family or a community or even of a nation ; and hence, woman can promote better than man inter-social, inter-racial and international understanding. Woman is not the worse but the better half of man although unfortunately in our country, as in ancient Greece and Rome, and practically in every part of Europe, woman has been treated as no better than chattel. But this is an age of equality, liberty and fraternity, and therefore, we should treat everybody—man, woman and an untouchable—as our equal, and offer him or her all the rights and privileges which we enjoy on certain fictitious claims.”

For some years atleast the partition of India Nehru used to impress upon our mind that unity is strength, unity is power, unity is welfare and prosperity, and that this unity cannot be achieved unless we introduce some common language as official or link language, unless we abolish the communal names from the educational institutions and also discourage religious teachings in them, unless we tolerate everybody's religious feelings, unless we liberate the untouchables from the caste prejudice and caste boycott, unless we encourage intercaste marriage which according to Nehru is one of the best means of national integration. Some people say that Nehru was an atheist or a nihilist. while other people say that Nehru was bred and brought up in western culture, and hence, he was a non-Hindu and a non-Indian. Whatever the people may say about him, it is a fact that Nehru was a great nationalist with a world vision or a world outlook, and that is why, probably, he always talked not only of national integration or unity but of international unity, world harmony and world peace. Nehru was not like ourselves cribbed, cabined and confined within the four walls of our Hindu or Muslim or Christian religion or even of Indian philosophy and culture ; and that is why, he could never conceive of any distinction between a man and a man or between a man and a woman or between a Brahmin and a Pariah.

Nehru believed in the centralisation of our government for cooperation and unity, but at the same time, he believed also in the autonomy of the States because he has seen that America inspite of her hundreds of States, and Russia too inspite of her various States, is united by exercising a centralized influence or power over the various States. America is an ideal country or

continent atleast in this respect because America, inspite of being the home of various races, various religions, various languages, stands always united as if she were one compact country like France or Germany or Japan or Britain with one language, one religion and one race.

Nehru was more an internationalist than a nationalist ; but then, because he found all around him that every country believed in nationalism in practice but in internationalism in theory, so he too tried to be a nationalist like others; that is why, he thought seriously of the problem of national integration particularly when he found that India is a country of various races, languages, religions, and therefore, there is every risk of national disintegration in a country like India. It was Gandhi primarily who worked all his life for national integration. He worked for the Hindu-Muslim unity ; he worked for the emancipation of Indian womanhood ; he worked for the liberation of the untouchables ; he worked further for rural uplift because he found that the villagers like the untouchables lived a very miserable life due to poverty, illiteracy, ill-health, and moral degeneration. He found also that the Native States in our country during British rule were just like ulcers. It was, ofcourse, Nehru and Patel who took the most drastic measure inorder to liquidate not only the Native States but the entire system of feudalism in India. Both Gandhi and Nehru succeeded marvelously in all their noble campaigns although the campaign against illiteracy, poverty and corruption has yet to be fought atleast for another quarter of a century before India could regard herself as a truly independent, self-sufficient, and progressive nation like atleast France or Britain, though not like America or Russia.

QUESTIONS

1. What is 'national integration ?'
 2. What lesson can be learnt from the two great devastating wars ?
 3. What is wrong with the bigger nations ?
 4. "Without national unity or integration, it is impossible to maintain one's existence these days."
- Discuss.

5. What are the obstacles that lie in the way of National Integration ?
 6. How 'National Integration' can be achieved in India ?
 7. Discuss the role of 'language' as a means of communication amongst the various sects and communities as well as the States of a country.
 8. Discuss the role of Hindi as vehicle for internal understanding and harmony and that of English for the purpose of international understanding, co-operation and peace.
 9. Discuss how the Britishers created 'communal' differences in India ?
 10. Discuss the impact of the Bible and the Koran on Mahatma Gandhi.
 11. Discuss the role of 'cultural exchange' between the races and the religions of the world for international goodwill and understanding.
 12. Describe how the caste-system of the Hindus led to the disintegration of "United India."
 13. What was the lot of 'untouchables' in a Hindu society ? How has this 'evil' been eradicated by Gandhi and Nehru in different spheres of social life ?
 14. Describe how Gandhi and Nehru removed the prejudice against intercaste or inter-racial or international marriage ?
 15. "Unity is strength, unity is power, unity is melfare and prosperity." Discuss and elaborate.
 16. "Nehru was a great nationalist with a world vision or world outlook." Discuss and amplify, how ?
 17. How is America an ideal country in respect of centralisation of government as well as the autonomy of States ? What was Nehru's ideal in this connection ?
 18. (a) Discuss the contributions of Mahatma Gandhi towards national integration ?
(b) How Gandhi and Nehru are co-equal in this respect ?
-

CHAPTER II

SOCIAL JUSTICE

What is Social Justice ?

Social justice means fairness in social relations and dealings. A society is a group of individuals just as a family is also a group of members connected by blood. It is by marriage between man and woman and by the procreation of children that the human family has been built up during several centuries. Previous to family life there was only a group-life which was, ofcourse, not social life because certain groups of human individuals used to move about from place to place, and sometimes they used to be disbanded and scattered due to some natural calamity such as flood or earthquake or fire in the forests, or sometimes due to some clash with other groups of human individuals used to be either killed or subjugated and whose women and children too used to belong to the conquering group. Thus there was no stability in the ancient form of group-life. The tribal or the clan life used to be dominated by some head who used to be called the chieftain of the tribe or the clan and to whom every one of the group used to submit like a slave, and to whom even the women had to be surrendered for the purpose of procreation of a sturdy race of successors to the chieftain. The chieftain used to be the dictator of the clan or the tribe, and he could do anything even with the lives of the group. Such human groups were more like the hordes of animals or beasts in the jungles because animals too had the same system of obedience and rule just as the prehistoric human beings used to have. So, it is with the creation of the human family that the human society came into existence.

We will have to consider how family or domestic justice came into being. The question of justice or fairness in the family came first from the relation between the husband and the wife. In very early centuries in Europe as well as in India, the relation between the husband and the wife was one of the master

and the servant, if not the slave; and naturally, the relation between the parents and the children was also one of dictatorship of the parents, particularly of the father to the children, while the relation between the children themselves was neither dictatorial nor servile but one of equality and brotherliness or sisterliness. With the advance of light and culture when the relation between man and woman improved, *i.e.* when the question of equality between man and woman was raised, the relation between husband and wife as well as the relation between parents and children also changed simultaneously introducing the idea of justice or fairness into domestic life. As the family is a much smaller unit than a society or a community, the idea of social justice or fairness came on a little later because the members of any particular society were not so intimately associated or so vitally connected in the earlier days as they are related now-a-days. The question of social justice has developed enormously in its connotation as well as in its denotation by the multiplication of the various duties and obligations of man in various fields of human activity. Social justice actually means now-a-days justice which is done or rather to be done to one and all the members of a society in some particular sphere where they are actively or passively engaged for the preservation and progress of human life. For example, if certain human individuals are ill-fed or ill-clad or ill-housed or ill-treated, or if the freedom or liberty of any individual member is threatened or actually injured, social justice demands that they should be well-fed well-clad, well-sheltered and well-treated by other members within the same society. In every part of the world, there are plenty of examples in which social injustice social tyranny, social prejudic, social degeneration are being committed deliberately and without any sufficient justification for such acts. Naturally, social justice is now-a-days one of the greatest problems in the modern human world particularly when mankind is becoming so keenly aware of their duties and obligations to one another. It is out of this keen sense of social justice that the political concept of democracy or the economic concept of Communism has shot up; and there are other concepts and ideologies which are springing up day by day with the evolution of human life and human civilization. Pandit Nehru, as a political thinker and also as the chief administrator

of our country, discovered that much of social injustice was being done in our country as in other less progressive and more backward countries it is being daily conspired by their government or by their own people. Pandit Nehru further realised that without social justice there could not be any real national integration because most people in a country suffer from some kind of grievous injustice due to which there is no peace or ease at home or in public life, and naturally, it would slowly and gradually lead up to a nation-wide discontent, displeasure, jealousy, hatred, enmity and even a revolt or a rebellion in a country. Therefore, Pandit Nehru insisted on social justice as a pre-requisite to national integration.

How can social justice be maintained ?

Pandit Nehru used to say that social justice can be best maintained by observing equality of rights and privileges. He pointed out every sphere of human activity where equality of rights and privileges should be observed. He used to say, "But if we think only of our rights and privileges and not of our duties and obligations, it would be no social justice but social injustice." He quoted first of all the law courts where perfect equality in the eye of law is strictly observed without any distinction of sex, sect, colour, race, rank, caste, or any other such artificial difference which has been put up by man against man in other spheres of life. He then quoted the inequality between man and woman, between the capitalist and the labourer, between the landlord and the tenant, between the master and the servant, between the Brahmin and the Sudra, between the strong and the weak, between the educated and the illiterate, between the poor and the rich, between the crippled and the able-bodied, between one sect or community and another, and so on. He used to say in his speeches and writings that all the conflicts, disharmonies, and all the hatred and enmity between individuals and groups follow invariably from the inequality of rights and privileges. He, therefore, insisted that in a world of democracy, in a free world, there should be universal suffrage or franchise or the right of vote for all adults—men and women; there should be no favouritism in any field, no partiality or nepotism in any sphere of human interest; there should be perfect toleration of all kinds of religious faith, political ideology,

social theory or work and economic planning. Nehru believed in cooperation, team work and coexistence; and that is why, he was so keen about social justice. He also wanted that whoever wanted to enjoy equality of rights and privileges must share also equality of duties and obligations. He pointed out that no duty or labour or obligation should be regarded as mean or undignified or vulgar as most of us regard many jobs and duties as below our dignity or beyond our capacity, and yet strangely enough we expect the some jobs to be performed by others who are our fellow-beings, fellow-workers and fellow-claimants to all the rights and privileges of life. Nehru used to say, "No person should be specially privileged, none amongst us should be regarded as an honourable exception; no job should be considered as below dignity, no duty should be shunned or shirked, no privilege can be claimed without any sufficient sacrifice or without fulfilling any obligation, because human life is all inter-related and inter-dependent, and hence, nobody can run away from his duties or obligations either to the family or to the society or to the State or to the world at large."

Feudalism and Capitalism must go :

So far our country is concerned, she suffered a lot in the hands of feudalism. As we have already said, the native princes and the landlords were a race of parasites or blood-suckers who made the poor tenants or subjects bleed white in order to yield the maximum amount of revenue to the blood-suckers and the parasites who had no other job in their life except to eat and drink and enjoy all sorts of bodily pleasures which even the brutes in the jungles would abhor. These princes and landlords of our country used to play the role of most servile worshippers of their British rulers who used to go for hunting in their forest preserves, who used to eat and drink in a magnificent style at their expense and also used to get very costly presents of jewelleries for their wives from their servile worshippers. Crores of rupees used to be drained out from the coffers of those foolish native princes and landlords by the political agents, the Governors and even the Viceroy. And how did the poor subjects of the native princes or the tenants of the landlords fare from day to day and from year

to year? Most miserably, not only in food, raiment and shelter but also in the inhuman treatment they used to receive from the tax-collectors if they failed to pay up in time the proper quota of their taxes. We are sincerely grateful to Pandit Nehru and Sardar Patel that they have destroyed, root and branch, the whole despicable race of the human parasites and bloodsuckers.

Pandit Nehru was out and out a socialist but he was not a communist as both Russia and China sometimes used to suspect him to be, and that is why, probably both Russia and China were drawn so close to India in their foreign relations with our country, although China betrayed India in 1962 and has shown her dragon teeth to India. Pandit Nehru realised very correctly, although he did not believe in any strife between capitalism and labour, that the working class in the factories, mills and workshops in any part of the world could not afford to go on indefinitely being exploited by the capitalists. He realised also that some social justice must have to be done to all classes of people whoever happen to be exploited and tyrannised.

Our country is not yet a highly industrialised country, and as such, there is no sharp contrast or conflict between the capitalists and the labourers. But then, the race of the capitalists is gradually putting up their heads just as the factories, the mills and the workshops are springing up with our development projects. If we visit the industrial towns or cities in our country we find that the capitalists are following the very same tactics of the western capitalists in order to earn the maximum of profits by paying the minimum of wages to the labourers whose standard of living is far more miserable than the standard of living of the working class in Manchester or Glasgow or London not because the British capitalists are more generous or liberal than the Indian capitalists but because Indian industries do not yield as much profits as the British industries are yielding, and hence, the wages of Indian labour are much lower than those of British labour. But the same slum-house living, the same ill-health of the labourers, the same filthy atmosphere or surrounding on the outskirts of the industrial centres are visible in our country as in other wealthier countries. Karl

Marx was perfectly justified in pointing out to the world at large that the capitalists who are the monopolists of certain industries commit the greatest injustice and injury on the labourers who earn all the wealth of their employers by their blood-spilling labour. But Karl Marx was not justified in saying that if the working class has to survive in the world the capitalist class has to be destroyed. There is no sense in such an argument because with the advance of science, industries and technology or even of agriculture there must remain a body of people who will be financiers or capitalists and who will naturally be the owners of the factories, mills and workshops, and at the same time there will always remain the working class—the race of skilled hands who will help the production of the various articles of industrial manufacture in every part of the world unless and until all the industries are nationalised in every country and all the governments also agree to distribute the profits of the various industries among the labourers of various categories in proportion to their skill and labour. The modern world, due to the great revolt of labour against capital, is trying to devise certain ways and means by which there can be an equitable distribution of capital and labour, which in other words is one of the greatest problems of the modern world. Pandit Nehru having been bred and brought up in England must have seen with his own eyes the miserable existence of the working class in the British industrial centres, and consequently, he wanted to avoid doing any social injustice to the working class in the factories and the workshops as well as to the peasants and the cultivators who grow our food in the rural areas. As Pandit Nehru was a socialist, he slowly and gradually tried to neutralise the monopolistic tendency of the industrialists or the capitalists of our country. But then, as India has not yet progressed much in her development projects, our government did not probably consider it high time to put the axe immediately upon the shoulders of the capitalists in order to relieve the growing distress and sufferings of the working class in our country. And yet Pandit Nehru took the risk of nationalising some of the private concerns such as insurance, railways, airways and one or two more concerns in order to reduce the miseries of the working class. Pandit Nehru used to say, “If capital is meant for exploitation and if power is

meant for tyranny, they should better go.” But the modern world has no other problem except the problem of the lust for power and the lust for wealth. Look at America which is really at present the wealthiest and hence the most powerful country in the world, and yet see how she is still trying to increase her power and wealth by making unauthorised and uninvited intrusion into various parts of Africa and Asia. It is a fact that America has only five per cent of the world population, and yet she is exploiting fifty per cent of the world resources simply because of her formidable nuclear power which not even Russia and China can dare challenge or resist. That is why, we say that on the part of Nehru or of any of us it is a mere wishful thinking to say that capitalism must or shall go simply because Marxism or socialism wishes it.

Dignity of labour :

In ancient India, the caste system originated from the distribution of labour. Learning was confined to the Brahmins ; the defence of the country was assigned to the Kshatriyas ; cultivation of the land was enjoined upon the Vaishyas ; manual service in the form of household work was relegated to the Sudras who used to be considered as the inferior-most caste of the Hindus and who slowly and gradually had to do all sorts of menial jobs—the job of the sweeper, the scavenger, the trade of the cobbler, the butcher, the carpenter *etc.* Mahatma Gandhi once demonstrated at Darjeeling and elsewhere the dignity of every kind of labour by sweeping the latrine and cleaning the commode with his own hands. But now-a-days, any body who belongs to any of the upper or superior castes would never stoop to use the broomstick for removing any filth or rubbish in his own house because he considers such a job as below his dignity. We have however seen many of the city fathers of our country, on the example of Mahatma Gandhi, going out in batches to sweep the filth or the rubbish lying on the public thoroughfares without the least sense of humiliation in the eyes of the world. Pandit Nehru used to tell us that everybody at home whether man or woman must be ready to do all sorts of odd jobs believing all the while that all jobs are equally dignified ; and for the same reason he used to say, “It is the height of social injustice to condemn a particular

section of our population to the work of sweepers or scavengers. Why should not the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas exchange sometimes their duties with those of the sweepers and the scavengers whom we have branded as the untouchables ?" In England we have seen how the graduates of Cambridge, Oxford, and London universities sometimes prefer to work as railway or ship-porters in order to learn the dignity of labour and earn honourable wages. It is said that Gladstone, who became four times the Prime Minister of England, used to work as a cobbler sometimes during his moments of leisure in order to learn the lesson how hard a job it is to cobble or to mend shoes ! In our country, the college or the university boys (not girls) have grown so fashionable and so stupidly queer that they feel it beneath their dignity even to carry in their hand a small suitcase or an attache-case. They would always engage some coolie when they go for shopping or marketing. But they do not feel ashamed when they make their own sisters or mothers work literally as maid-servants while they themselves go like lords or dandies in trousers aping the style of the foreigners whose shoes they are not fit even to unlace ! This is the wretchedness of the mentality of our modern generations, and that is why, both Gandhi and Nehru most bitterly lashed the youths of our country who have learnt no lesson on the dignity of labour.

No Favouritism or Nepotism :

Nehru pointed out to us that in a country like India, where there are so many races, religions, sects, communities and languages, national integrity can never be maintained if any slightest favouritism or nepotism or partiality is shown to any sect or community or race on any pretext whatsoever. Favouritism creates misunderstanding, jealousy and even enmity ; it creates a kind of ill-feeling which slowly and gradually grows up and assumes a threatening magnitude and which ultimately leads to communal, sectarian and racial strife disturbing the law and order and peace or harmony in a country. Nehru knew quite well that to favour the Hindu community against the Muslim community, to encourage any of the States in preference to any other State in the country, or even to help the development or propagation of any particular Indian language in preference to any other major native language of our country is indeed

a dangerous game ; and that is why, he was always cautious about maintaining the interests of the two major communities — Hindus and Muslims, and also about the regional languages against the Hindi language. In order to maintain peace in the country and to prevent any kind of national disintegration, he advocated even the cause of English as an associate language in order to pacify the Southern States of our country which protested very strongly against the Hindi language when it was first declared as the *Rashtrabhasha* or the national language. He was keenly aware also of the great social injustice which had been done for centuries to the depressed classes of our population ; and that is why, by legislation, he enacted that for some years to come the scheduled classes should be encouraged in their education and in appointments in the various services by certain scholarships, stipends or awards and also by some percentage of their number to represent the various government and private services in India. He noticed also that the depressed classes were practically cut off from the main population of our country in duties as well as in festivities ; and that is why, he issued orders under legislation that the scheduled classes would be permitted to attend any educational institution, to attend the temple for worship, and also to participate in all the religious and social festivities of our country. It was, of course, Mahatma Gandhi who took the initiative of doing social justice to the downtrodden classes of the Hindu community, and it was Pandit Nehru who actually put into action the initiative of Mahatma Gandhi.

Equality between Man and Woman :

It was not earlier than the eighteenth century in England that woman secured her equality with man ; and it was the English people who advocated the cause of the emancipation of Indian womanhood particularly because the English people could not stand the idea or the sight of woman's slavery to man in any part of the world. It was primarily English education in India, particularly, during the latter part of the nineteenth century which opened the eyes of the Indian population to the emancipation of their women. It was, more truly, Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Sadharan Brahmo Samaj, founded by him, that actually inspired or initiated the woman of our country to

take the benefit of English education by coming out of the purdah and attending the English High Schools in the various cities of our country. Our women exerted themselves a little, and our men too yielded to their demand in breaking through the purdah which was a sort of iron curtain for centuries. Our women began to come out of the four walls of their houses, to attend schools and colleges, to change their ways of living by taking part in all sorts of outdoor activities which not only made them more cheerful and healthy than they were ever before but which infused into their hearts the spirit rivalry and competition for excelling their male partners in every field of activity. Now-a-days we find in our country plenty of women reading in the various universities, working as administrators and legislators, following the trades of medicine, law, engineering and many other occupations which used to be monopolised by men in our country. Women, not only in India, but in every other part of the world have shaken off their shyness and modesty, their inferiority complex which, ofcourse, was injected into their mind by their parents or husbands or brothers or the religious priests who exercised the greatest social tyranny over the female folk of our country through the male folk that suffered continuously from a superiority complex. Look at Pandit Nehru's sister Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit who has been working as an Indian ambassador in various parts of the world. Look at also Nehru's daughter, Indira Gandhi, who is now working as one of the cabinet ministers in charge of Information and Broadcasting. Look at Mrs. Sarojini Naidu and her daughter Miss Padmaja Naidu—the mother worked as the Governor of Uttar Pradesh while the daughter is now holding the same position in Bengal. There are many other eminent women of our country who have proved conclusively that man is in no way superior to woman except in boasting and tyrannising. The greatest social injustice which was done to our women for centuries has now been undone. Pandit Nehru used to say "Woman is not the 'weaker vessel' as we find it mentioned in the Bible. Biologically speaking, man and woman are born for fulfilling certain different functions but that does not cancel any of her abilities for doing the same kind of work which man is capable of performing. Physically speaking, woman

may be slightly weaker than man; but otherwise she is in no way inferior to man; her intellect is as sharp and brilliant as man; her courage and determination often excel man's courage and determination, her practical wisdom far excels man's; and I have no doubt that woman will lead man in our country in the near future as she is doing now-a-days in most of the western countries. Ofcourse, I do not mean that woman will change her sex and perform the same biological function which man has been doing since the very dawn of the human race on earth." Mahatma Gandhi also said while addressing the women of our country, "It is a mistaken idea that woman is born a slave to man; rather it is man who has made a slave of woman, and thereby has committed the greatest injustice to his partner as also the greatest insult to his Creator who observes no distinction between man and woman or even between the great and the small. Woman is undoubtedly born to be the mother as man is born to be the father, and none of them can exchange places with each other. But then, woman must exert herself in India as she has been exerting herself in Europe and America, not in the wrong fashion, not to play the toy of pleasure nor to be a taxing burden to her eternal partner but to be a help-mate to him at home as well as abroad as I find the rural women of our country working in the fields under sun and shower in order to help their male partners."

Cooperative and Interdependent life :

To reduce or remove altogether social injustice from our country, Pandit Nehru recommended cooperative and interdependent life for all. Pandit Nehru believed that the human world like the natural world is one compact whole, and all the human and natural particles are interconnected and interdependent. It is this law of interrelation which is keeping together all human beings, all animals and birds, all reptiles and insects and flies on the earth's surface, and which is also keeping together all the millions and billions of stars, planets, suns and other heavenly bodies in this limitless universe. Nehru believed that social justice depends entirely upon cooperation and interdependence; and that is why, he often talked of non-alignment and coexistence in the political sphere. By cooperative and interdependent life in the human

world Nehru meant that man cannot neglect woman, that the capitalist cannot exploit the labourer, that the strong cannot tyrannise over the weak, that there can not be any unusual accumulation of power and wealth in any particular country, that man cannot always hate every body, that man cannot sit idle enjoying incessantly the fruit of the labour of others, that there cannot be any harmonious development or progress in the human world, that the world shall have no peace even in the future if man does not learn to be cooperative or if he does not recognise the law of interdependence in any sphere of his activities. Nehru sincerely believed that all the various forms of social, political, religious and economic injustice which are being committed in every part of the human world are chiefly due to want of cooperation between individuals as well as between collective bodies ; they are also due to the lack of consciousness or realisation of the supreme law of interdependence which is operating everywhere for the evolution or devolution of mankind or of the universe itself. All the great scientists and philosophers of the modern world are now realising this great fact that without the cooperation and interdependence of the various countries and nations, there cannot be any harmony or peace in the human world. But what is this interdependence or cooperation ? It demands that man should help man, woman should help man, and that every nation should help man, and that every nation should help every other nation. It is only then injustice, tyranny, exploitation, slavery, poverty will disappear from the human world.

Recognition of the Common Man :

The question is, who is really the common man, and how can he be recognized ? The communist declare from the house-top that the working class represents the common man and that the common man is most neglected in every part of the world. But in our opinion, everybody is the common man whoever is poor, down-trodden, exploited, and deprived of the fundamental rights of freedom, the privilege of enjoying the adequate fruit of his labour and the common amenities of life which others enjoy without any ostensible reason or pretext. In our country, everybody is the common man because every body is extremely

poor, because every body is more or less exploited, because every body is oppressed or suppressed, not by the laws of the country but by certain individuals, who are the industrialists, the commercialists, the business magnates, and also who are sometimes in a higher official position, or who claim to be comparatively more educated than others or rather who claim to be more aristocratic in social status, or who are privileged to be elected or appointed, by fair or foul means, as honourable ministers or councillors or as high government officials holding the key positions of administration in our country. Pandit Nehru noticed all these discrepancies in the ladder of officialdom or in the scale of private life or in the hierarchy of the capitalists, landlords and native princes. He devoted much of his time and energy to the cause of the common man in order to relieve him of his distress and to raise him in the eyes of the world as well as in his own eyes. He has done the greatest good to our country by liquidating the Native States and also by abolishing the Zamindari system. He has thereby liberated the race of the tyrannised tenants and the exploited peasants. He thought of liberating also the race of the workmen in the industrial and commercial concerns; but in our opinion, when Nehru believed in the industrialisation of our country, how could he at the same time think of reducing the miseries of the working class particularly when in no part of the world, the problem of Capital *versus* Labour has not yet been solved by any body whether he is a democrat or a socialist or a communist. The common man in the Communist countries is in no way better off than his counterpart in the democratic countries. Communism has merely used the common man as a smoke-screen for his further exploitation and adding further to his misery. Just go and visit Russia and China, although we should not compare Russia with China in any respect, and see for yourself if the Russian or Chinese common man is any way better off than the common man in any part of Europe or America. Marx and Lenin discovered a formula for the amelioration of the miseries of the working class but unfortunately their formula is not practically workable, and besides, the lust for power and wealth in man will never allow the common man to raise his head above the water however much he may fight and bleed to death

for his liberation from the shackles of tyranny and exploitation. Some of the economists and political thinkers of the world have been, like Pandit Nehru, thinking of this greatest problem of the common man, but we have great doubts if any such thinking will lead to any solution unless and until the whole human world comes upto the same level of prosperity and happiness, or unless and until all human beings in every part of the world are made to forget completely their innate nature—their lust for power and wealth, their instinct for exploitation and tyranny, their incorrigible impulse for jealousy and hatred without any sufficient cause. Hence, the social injustice which is being done to the common man in every part of the world is almost incurable. Communism, Socialism, Democracy—none can really help the cause of the common man and relieve his misery.

State-Ownership of Land and Capital :

Some amount of social injustice to the common man can possibly be reduced provided there is state ownership of land and capital. But can any state-ownership be possible unless the state is a socialist state? And if a State is a socialist state, the ownership of land and capital may not benefit much the common man, as it is not doing so far atleast in the two big communist or socialist countries—Russia and China. We hear a lot about the collective ownership of land and other material assets in these two countries but when we analyse their method of distribution of the wealth and the power, we find that there is very little difference in the lot of the working class who are undoubtedly getting employment and who are also getting their food and raiment and also shelter in exchange of their hardest labour; but are they enjoying the same privileges of power, comfort and other amenities of life which the big administrators, the police and the armed forces are enjoying in Russia and China? Ofcourse, the Chinese common man is the worst in the world because he does not get even one square meal a day or even two yards of cloth per year; besides, he is forced to join the armed forces on the most ostensible plea that he will have to sacrifice his life for the liberation of the common men in other countries who are being tyrannised and exploited by all the imperialist and colonialist countries, and chiefly by

America and Great Britain. Therefore, we say that State ownership of Land and Capital, and their equitable distribution amongst the working class is the biggest hoax which the Communist countries are practising on the common man in order to make him all the more miserable.

QUESTIONS

1. What is 'group life'? Describe some of its characteristics?
2. How the question of 'equality' brought about the introduction of 'social justice' into domestic life? Discuss.
3. Why 'social justice' is a pre-requisite to national integration?
4. "Pandit Nehru used to say that 'social justice' can be best maintained by observing equality of rights and privileges."
Discuss.
5. How did Nehru remove the gross inequalities of 'social injustice' in a free democracy?
6. Karl Marx has said :—
"If the working class has to survive in the world, the capitalist class has to be destroyed."
Do you agree with this solution of the Capital and Labour struggle?
If not, why not?
7. (a) Do you approve that the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas should exchange their duties with those of the Sweepers and the Scavengers?
(b) What was Nehru's thinking?
(c) How did Gandhiji like the job? What was the 'idea' behind?
8. (a) Enumerate the defects of "favouritism" or "nepotism."
(b) How did Nehru maintain the balance of the interests of the two major communities—Hindus and Muslims in India?

- (c) Why did Nehru advocate the cause of English as an 'associate language' in India ?
9. What steps did Nehru take to remove the great "social injustice" being done to the depressed classes in India ?
10. Discuss :—
 "It was Pandit Nehru who actually put into practice the initiative of Mahatma Gandhi of doing 'social justice' to the down-trodden classes of the Hindu community."
11. (a) Discuss the condition of women in India prior to the introduction of English education in India.
 (b) How has English education emancipated the women of our country from 'seclusion' and 'purdah' ?
12. "Man is in no way superior to woman." Discuss the *pros and cons* of the statement.
13. Discuss Nehru's impression regarding "woman's superiority over man."
14. Elucidate Mahatma Gandhi's quotation :—
 "Man has committed the greatest injustice to woman."
15. Explain :—
 "Pandit Nehru believed that the human world, like the natural world, is one complete whole; and all the human and natural particles are inter-connected and inter-dependent. It is the law of inter-relation that is keeping together all human beings."
16. What did Nehru mean by "co-operative and inter-dependent life" in the human world ? Explain.
17. (a) Why did Nehru often talk of 'non-alignment and co-existence' in the political sphere ?
 (b) Wherefrom he learnt those ideas ?
18. What steps had Nehru taken to ameliorate the status of the :—
 (a) Common man ?
 (b) Tenants and the exploited peasants ?
 (c) Workmen in industrial and commercial concerns ?
-

CHAPTER III

SECULARISM

What does Secularism mean ?

Secularism means a doctrine which requires that the basis of morality should be non-religious; it means a policy of excluding religious teaching from schools under State control. Theocracy is practically the opposite word of Secularism. Theocracy means a government or a State in which God is the sovereign, and religion is the law. Pandit Nehru saw in his own life time how the two major communities—the Hindus and the Muslims—fought against each other. Ofcourse, the strife between these two communities was engineered by our former British rulers whose policy was always to divide and rule, and who therefore always tried to sow the seeds of hatred, misunderstanding and enmity between the two communities. Pandit Nehru noticed further that the Muslims and the Hindus are equally orthodox and fanatical in the matter of religion, and that is why, he felt that whenever there was any kind of interference with their religious feeling or sentiment, they forgot altogether that they had lived in the same country, that they were children of the same soil, and that they had imbibed each other's culture and ways of living for atleast four or five centuries. Pandit Nehru further considered that India was partitioned purely on the communal basis and Jinnab, the evil genius of the Muslims and the stooge of the Britishers, demanded an exchange of the Muslim population with India which India, ofcourse, refused simply because most of the wiser Muslims of India did not like to shift their motherland to Pakistan which was in the beginning and which is even now a very poor country which has been changing its government atleast one dozen times during the past eighteen years, and which has been throughout under military rule. Pandit Nehru had a great foresight and also a deep insight. He gave a new name to our country and government *i.e.* secular state and

secular government. In England the Church used to rule the country for some years at certain intervals, and that is why, the English people invented the name of 'Theocracy' which they attached to the Church rule, while when England used to be ruled by Kings and Queens, they attached the name of 'secular' government.

Mr. Jinnah named the newly truncated limb of India as Pakistan, because his sole aim was to make Pakistan a purely Islamic or theocratic state ; and the policy of the succeeding heads of the Pakistan government has been throughout a policy of either driving out all the non-Muslims from West and East Pakistan or to convert by force all the non-Muslims so that Pakistan would be absolutely an Islamic or theocratic State.

Nehru felt that theocratic government in any part of the world would be a dangerous government. He noticed that in India too, some of the orthodox Hindus have a tendency to make India a theocratic State just as some of the orthodox Muslims have the same tendency. As one-tenth of the population of India comprises the Muslim community, it is greatly risky for the other major community to think of regarding their country as a theocratic state because in the event of such an orthodox tendency of both the communities, it is quite natural that some kind of tension is bound to be created in every field of administration and legislation in our country leading to a complete disruption of the State. Nehru foresaw all these risks or dangers ; and that is why, he never encouraged the orthodox cries of the Hindu Sabha people or of the Muslim League people who ofcourse being the minority did not raise any such question ever since the partition of India. Nehru was particularly cautious at every step because he knew that religion is the tenderest spot in every human heart, and if it is injured in any manner it may set ablaze the whole country with a religious war as the Christian Crusade against the Saracens has marked the pages of history of long years with unnecessary bloodshed and destruction of life and property on both sides. That is why, Nehru declared his government as secular government and his country as a secular state.

The basis of morality should be non-religious :

Ofcourse, morality and religion are most intimately con-

nectep; but then, in political affairs if religion is closely associated with morality or justice, it is doubtful if either religion or morality can maintain its position of impartiality, fairness or justice. We quote concrete examples from East Pakistan where one-third of the entire population represented the Hindu community. As we have already said, Pakistan since its very birth has been following the policy of a theocratic state particularly because West Pakistan has been dominating East Pakistan in all affairs of legislation and administration, and also because there has been no Hindu element in West Pakistan ever since the partition of India. And besides, West Pakistan Muslims are fanatical in their religions and other affairs; they are extremely greedy of power and are inclined to exploitation of their own brethren; and that is why, in the very beginning, they tried to inflict Urdu as the State Language upon East Pakistan in which most of the people—both Muslims, Hindus and Christians have been cultivating the Bengali language for centuries; and that is why, the East Pakistan Muslims put up a very stiff opposition to the imposition of the Urdu language upon them. Ofcourse, the East Pakistan Muslims won the victory against the West Pakistan Muslims in the battle of the State language. Since then the West Pakistan Muslims have been very cruel and vindictive towards their own community brethren in all vital affairs; but because they could not feed fat their ancient grudge, they started being vindictive and cruel towards the minority community *i.e.*; the Hindu community. The West Pakistan Muslims adopted a simple strategy in order to pump out at irregular intervals the Hindu element from East Pakistan by creating Hindu-Muslim riots in East Pakistan by inciting the goonda elements of the Muslim community, who were also imported from West Pakistan, to commit arson, rape and plunder on the innocent and helpless Hindus. The West Pakistan Muslims have been following the same tactics as the British rulers in India had followed throughout their regime in order to keep alive for ever the hatred and enmity between the two major communities. Even during the recent aggression of Pakistan on Jammu and Kashmir, West Pakistan has made a fool of East Pakistan by draining out blood and capital from the people of East Pakistan in order to hide the face of West Pakistan from the shame of misrule, tyranny, exploitation.

That is why, some of the saner Muslim leaders of East Pakistan are organising these days an open revolt against the West Pakistan government in order to set up an independent government of their own or to merge into the Indian Republic just as Jammu and Kashmir did in 1947 and became an integral part of the Indian Union.

West Pakistan has always been exploiting the Muslims of East Pakistan by raising the religious question, which, we have already said, is the tenderest question in every human heart. That is why, West Pakistan has been sacrificing all its sham morality, sham religion, and sham everything in order to achieve her own selfish end and not the real welfare of the entire State of Pakistan.

Policy of excluding Religious Teaching from Educational Institutions under State control.

Although Nehru declared India as a secular state yet he never actively prevented religious teachings in the educational institutions because he followed a policy of non-intervention in the case of the places of worship, religious teachings in schools or colleges, and also the sectarian names of the denominational educational institutions. He knew quite well that it is as dangerous to interfere in religious matters as it is to favour or patronise any kind of sectarianism or communalism for purposes of administration or legislation of his country of which he was *de jure* the Prime Minister and *de facto* the dictator. Some people used to suspect that Nehru was either an atheist or a nihilist, and that is why, he took such an attitude of indifference towards religion or towards all ecclesiastical matters. But then, the real truth is that Nehru was a great believer in the Supreme Power which ruled over all things and which shaped their destiny ; otherwise how could he love mankind, particularly, the little children so much. Even the animals and the birds had such a great fascination for him. He has confessed several times that he used to be completely enchanted by the very mysteries of this universe although he could not possibly explain any of the mysteries. But he knew this much that man has to fall back upon some faith of his own—which is his own religion or philosophy and which he pursues at least during certain rare and blessed moments of his life when he completely

merges himself into that eternal stream of time and space—all of which may be an illusion and yet they have such a remarkable significance for the thinking or the meditating soul.

The orthodox section of the Hindu Community many a time tried to win over Nehru in order to make religious teachings compulsory in all educational institutions. He gave a very fitting reply to those self-elected champions of religious teachings, "I am prepared to make it compulsory to teach the Koran and the Bible in all institutions where there is no Muslim or Christian Student. How would you like the idea?" Nehru knew the pulse of his countrymen—whether they were Hindus or Muslims or Christians; he knew their prejudices as well as their other weaknesses; and hence, it was difficult for a man of ordinary intelligence to corner him or to outwit him.

No Favouritism on Communal, Sectarian or class basis :—

Secularism demands that there should be no favouritism on communal, sectarian or class basis. Nehru knew this more than anybody else in India. That is way, he was very particular about granting equal rights and privileges to all sects, communities and classes. He was always in favour of helping the backward classes to come upto the level of the advanced or progressive classes of the population. In his eyes as well as in the eyes of every fair-minded person, the scheduled class of the Hindu Community was the poorest and most backward class, and hence, he gave the maximum of facilities and opportunities in the matter of education in the form of scholarships and free studentships and sometimes even free boarding and lodging in certain deserving cases. He gave similar facilities and opportunities particularly to the Muslim community because he was perfectly aware that the Muslims were far more backward in many respects than the Hindus. It is a fact that most of the Muslims in India as well as Pakistan are far less educased, far more handicapped in their finances than most of the Hindus. Many of us are not even aware how many scholarships and free studentships are granted every year to the Muslim students in our country, how many of them are given appointments in the various government and private services. Nehru was so much liberal in his awards of financial and other kinds of aid to the Muslim community that some

of the short sighted Indians used to say at his back that the whole of the Nehru family is prejudiced in favour of the Muslims, and that is why, during the Nehru regime, the Muslims will always prosper while the Hindus will be pushed into the background in every field. They used to accuse him often of keeping Muslim officers on key positions which according to these short-sighted persons is not a wise policy because the Muslims in India are likely to turn out to be fifth-columnists in the event of a political crisis. But their suspicion or fear has been completely falsified at least on two occasions—once in 1947 when Pakistan attacked Kashmir, and another time when Pakistan made a more violent aggression on Kashmir and India on the 5th of August of 1965. The Muslims in India have behaved most loyally to the Government of India and to the Hindu community. During the recent Indo-Pak war, so many Muslim Jawans and officers of our armed forces sacrificed their lives while fighting against the Muslims of Pakistan. Abdul Hamid's name has become immortal in the pages of Indian history which will testify in the remotest future how sincere, faithful and loyal Indian Muslims are to our country which they consider as their motherland as we Hindus do so. Apart from the common Muslims in India there are many other leading Muslims who hold eminent positions in our Republic as Cabinet Ministers, Governors, Ambassadors and even as the Vice-President which is the second highest official position in the Indian Republic.

Universal Religious Toleration :

Secularism demands also universal religious toleration. There are so many temples, mosques and churches in our country that one feels tempted to say that India is the home of all religions just as India is also the home of all philosophies, all races, all languages, all sects, and all communities. Nehru was such a liberal-minded person that he felt perfectly at home in every place of worship, and he could identify himself thoroughly with any religious sect or community without professing or practising any of their creeds. Nehru himself was out and out a secular spirit, and that is why, probably during his regime of seventeen or eighteen years, the followers of every religion felt perfectly at ease in India. We have

noticed how Nehru in 1962 sheltered Dalai Lama and ten thousand Buddhist monks who were persecuted by the Chinese and driven out from Tibet. So many of the respectable and common Muslims found their home in India when they could not stay in East or West Pakistan because of the cruel persecution and exploitation of their own Muslim Government at Karachi, or Rawalpindi or Dacca. Nehru's religious toleration is indeed a great lesson not only to India but to all other countries of the world. We have seen how the Jews were persecuted by the Germans during the first World War, how the Buddhists have been persecuted by the Chinese although China was the home of Buddhism for several centuries, how the Turks, the Arabians have been persecuted by their own people, and how even the English people were persecuted in America before the War of American Independence. But no historian can certify that the followers of any religion on earth have ever been persecuted in India. Kashmir is said to be a Muslim predominating State, and yet we have seen how Kashmir preferred to be ruled by a Hindu Maharaja for years and at last agreed to come under the government of the Indian Union. All these facts go to prove that India has been always secular in spirit as well as in practice; and therefore, when Bhutto complained before the United Nations (The Security Council) that the Hindus of Kashmir had been committing genocide on the Kashmiri Muslims, it was nothing but a downright lie Bhutto was telling before the world in broad daylight.

Nehru's secularism means a universal brotherhood of all religions in the world. Just as he never liked his own religious or philosophical faith to be disturbed by anybody so also he never liked anybody interfering with the religious faith of anybody else. Everywhere he believed in toleration, co-operation and co-existence. Like Mahatma Gandhi Nehru used to say, "We can find the image of God in every man, in every idol, in every temple, in every mosque, and in every church, and so, nobody should dare insult that image of God whether in a Muslim or in a Christian or in a Hindu." From this very significant utterance we can safely conclude that Nehru was a highly religious-minded person, however much certain persons may have regarded him as an atheist or a nihilist. Nehru's conception of religion or divinity was not like ours, and that is why,

he appeared to many eyes in a different perspective.

Equal Franchise.

Nehru was out and out a democrat whatever other name (Socialist, Communist, democratic socialist etc.) his countrymen may put up on him. He believed first in individual freedom, and then, in collective freedom. That is why, he believed in equal franchise for both man and woman as also for all citizens irrespective of any caste or creed, rank or position, colour or race. He believed further that without the equal right to vote, there is no sense in freedom of any kind. Formerly, in our country women had no right to vote, and naturally, half of the entire population of our country was debarred from exercising their will upon the framing of laws for the administration of our country. The chief reason for this denial of the right to vote on the part of women was that most of our women were illiterate, and naturally, how could they understand the significance of voting for election to the Parliament or the Legislative Assembly or the Council? But then, the percentage of literacy has not much improved even amongst the male folk of our country; and yet every male adult has been exercising his right of vote at least for the last three or four decades. We, for ourselves, fail to understand the fun of voting on the part of a person—male or female—when he or she does not know what he or she is voting for. That is why, we say that universal franchise in a mostly illiterate country is meaningless. And yet Nehru believed in universal franchise and equal franchise, and both male and female franchise.

After the partition of India some people raised the question if the untouchables (scheduled or depressed class) or any of the minority communities should have the right to vote for election to the Parliament. But Nehru openly said that whether majority or minority, whether scheduled caste or superior caste, whether Anglo-Indians or Eurasians, whether foreigners or natives of the soil—all must have the right to vote provided they fulfil the legal conditions of domicile, soundness of mind, maturity in age, and other such conditions which are generally laid down

for the rules of voting. Nehru's real motive was to offer equal opportunities to all.

QUESTIONS

1. What is Secularism ? How is it distinguishable from Theocracy ?
2. How was Jinnah the stooge of the Britishers ?
3. "To Nehru, theocratic government in India was a dangerous government." Discuss, how ?
4. Why Nehru declared his government as 'secular government' and his country as a 'secular State' ?
5. Discuss Nehru's faith in the Supreme Power.
6. "The Hindu community failed to win over Nehru to make religious teachings compulsory in schools." Why ?
7. Discuss Nehru as a liberal.
Or
Discuss Nehru's religious toleration.
8. Discuss :—
"India has been always secular in spirit as well as in practice."
9. "Nehru's secularism means a universal brotherhood of all religions in the world."
Discuss and justify.
10. "Nehru believed in toleration, cooperation and co-existence."
Expand and elucidate.
11. Explain :—
"Like Mahatma Gandhi, Nehru used to say, "We can find the image of God in every man, in every idol, in every temple, in every mosque, and in every church, and so, no body should dare insult that image of God whether in Muslim or in a Christian or in a Hindu."
12. Discuss Nehru's conception of religion or divinity.
13. Was Nehru an atheist or a nihilist ?
14. Discuss :—
"Nehru was out and out a democrat."

CHAPTER IV

SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO PROBLEMS

What does Scientific Approach mean ?

As Nehru had been a student of Science he was extremely fond of the word 'scientific', and he often used it even without attaching the real significance of the word. When he talked of the scientific approach to problems, he meant surely a systematic and not a random analysis of problems, because as a student of science he knew that without being methodical or systematic one cannot arrive at any logical conclusion or discover any truth or solution to a problem. What he really meant by scientific approach to problems—national or international—is probably a consideration of such problems with due regard to local conditions, present circumstances, national and international relations, and also the future possibilities or developments of any new problem connected with the problems under consideration, and on top of all, a consideration of national welfare, harmony and peace in any particular country in which the problems arise and required to be solved.

Scientific approach means a realistic approach. Take, for example, two major problems of our country—our relations with U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. on the one hand, while on the other, our relations with Pakistan and China, our immediate neighbours. Many people of our country are now saying that Nehru was not wise to trust China so much as he did when Chou-en-Lai visited India twice or thrice and Nehru also visited China at least once, particularly when China struck India in October, 1962. Some of us do complain also that Nehru had trusted Pakistan too much or rather had been unduly conciliating to Pakistan. But to do justice to Nehru, what else could he do with his immediate neighbours? If both China and Pakistan have betrayed India, it cannot be any fault of Nehru or of India herself. There are certain countries which are erratic by nature or by changing circumstance, and which

as such seem to behave treacherously to their immediate neighbours. Just consider for a moment the relations between Russia and China. Are not both of them Communist Countries? Have they not the same object, the same creed, the same goal? But how is it that there is such a great split between them now which is actually taking each of them from the other miles away? Similarly, how could Nehru or anybody else in India dream that Pakistan would make secret preparations of war against India who has done no injury to Pakistan but who, on the other hand, has been always friendly and conciliating to her?

Then again, did America ever dream that all the arms and ammunition, which she had supplied to Pakistan in order to fight China if China ever made any aggression on the northern border of our sub-continent, would be used by Pakistan against India on an unprovoked war? Could America ever dream that Pakistan would be inclined to be in collusion with China, the arch enemy of U.S.A. and the whole world, without any cause whatsoever, particularly when Pakistan is a member of the SEATO, the CENTO, and the Commonwealth of Nations? So, if a big country like America can commit the blunder of entrusting arms and ammunition to the hands of Pakistan, how could Nehru be so much in the wrong when he trusted both Pakistan and China particularly when none of them had shown their concealed dagger at the back of India?

Now with regard to the problem of the relations of India with either U.S.A. or U.S.S.R. Nehru made a really scientific approach to it, and accordingly, followed the policy of non-alignment with both of them although both of them tried and are even now trying their level best to get India into their fold. Nehru is not alive today. But had he been alive he would have positively advised us to keep on our friendly relations with both U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. although both of these big countries are enemies to each other. We should know once for all that China can never be a friend to India particularly because China is now out to dominate Asia (if not the whole world), and whoever would come in between her and her lust for power would be her greatest enemy. Both Russia and America have the same axe to grind in Asia. Russia cannot join hands

with America because Russia stands for Communism, while America stands for the destruction of Communism; but then, because Russia does not want China to be the supreme power in Asia, she may agree temporarily to join hands with India or America in order to cripple China but not to destroy her completely. Hence, India's interest should lie in being on friendly terms with both U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. so that China may keep aloof from India. That is the real scientific approach of Nehru to the problem of India's relations with the two great nuclear powers.

What are the ways of Scientific Approach ?

While discussing or explaining the scientific approach to problems, Nehru used to tell us that there are several ways of such an approach and that we should seriously and judiciously consider these various ways of scientific approach to any national or international problem, otherwise we may be involved in troubles that may cost us dearly in the national as well as in the international spheres. Nehru mentioned a few ways as the following for our consideration so that our solution to any problem may be practicable as well as beneficial. Nehru emphasised, first of all, the consideration of national interest, national prestige and national gain which again should be in relation to human welfare, world unity and world peace. Next he emphasized the practical way of looking at things or rather at the problems. At the next step he advised us always to march with the times and to be out of date in any manner, because to think of any problem in terms of the past, which is long dead, is stupid and impractical. Nehru's advice to us is to do away with ancient methods, manners, conventions, and even usages and customs because these breed prejudice and superstition in the human heart and thus prevent the human mind from having a correct perspective. Nehru then advises us to consider all the pros and cons of a problem so that there may not be any regret afterwards due to any oversight. Last of all, Nehru, while considering any national or international problem, advises us to have a self-sacrificing and conciliating attitude so that there may be some kind of amicable adjustment or amicable settlement of any dispute or problem which may arise within the State or outside the State.

Consideration of National Interest in terms of Human Welfare :

When Nehru talked of scientific approach to a problem he generally thought of international problems ; and even if he thought of any national problem, he thought of it in international terms particularly because he knew that no nation now-a-days can exist without being related closely or remotely with other nations. So, Nehru's advice to us is that whenever such problems arise, we should consider them in terms of international or human welfare. For example, when Nehru wanted to give his opinion on the banning of the nuclear tests or on the proliferation of the nuclear weapons he had to keep in view how far nuclear tests or proliferation of nuclear weapons would be injurious or dangerous to the cause of human welfare, and not how far it would be helpful to the countries who dabbled in nuclear weapons in order to serve their national purpose or interest. Everybody knows that the nuclear tests, particularly when they are carried on either in the air or in the water, are most injurious to human, animal, bird, fish and even vegetable lives because the fall-outs of the nuclear explosions vitiate the air and the water so adversely that whoever happens to breathe such a vitiated air or drink such a polluted water or even eat the vegetables, fish or birds living in such a vitiated atmosphere, is sure to undergo certain physiological changes which may cripple not only him but even four or five generations of his which are yet to come. So, Russia or America may gain by the nuclear tests particularly when they carry them on in far distant regions from their own, and that is why, they will vote for such tests ; but then, according to Nehru, India and other countries should put up a stiff opposition to such a dangerous scheme.

When, again, Nehru was asked to give his opinion on the necessity or desirability of the United Nations or the Commonwealth of Nations, he considered the whole problem from all points of view and particularly, from the angle of world unity and world harmony. Nehru did not consider the Commonwealth of Nations from merely the British point of view. nor did he consider the United Nations from only the American point of view because he knew that the Commonwealth of Nations was a proposal that came from the Britishers

who had lost their supremacy in the East and the West, or because the United Nations was a proposal that came from the Americans behind whom, ofcourse, the British political brains were working. He thought that in this world of strife, rivalry, greed for power and wealth, and all sorts of exploitation, it is very difficult for a small or weak country to defend herself or to develop her resources without the protection and aid of some big power like U.S.A. or U.S.S.R. Ofcourse, Nehru knew that all big powers form such blocs or organisations merely out of self-interest either to exploit the resources of the lesser countries or to enhance their power and status in the international sphere. Nehru considered the risks as well as the advantages of the problem, and then he advised his country to be a member of the United Nations as well as of the Commonwealth of Nations.

Practical Way of Looking at Things :

Many people have said that Nehru was a visionary or a dreamer, and not much of a practical man. But then, like Ayub or anybody else he did not advise his country to be a member of the SEATO the CENTO because unlike Ayub he feared that all these territorial organisations are nothing but military organisations of some of the Afro-Asian countries with U.S.A. who would use all the joint armed forces against Russia the most powerful communist country in the world. Nehru considered seriously that Russia is much nearer to India than America, and further, India being inclined to democratic socialism is further away from U.S.A. than from U.S.S.R.; and hence, to join the S.E.A.T.O. and the CENTO would be positively antagonising Russia who is India's nearest and greatest neighbour. Nehru looked at the practical side of this particular problem, and declared openly that India would be following the policy of non-alignment, and as such he could not possibly join either SEATO or CENTO. If anybody says, Nehru did the wrong thing by keeping aloof from the military pacts or alliances, he must be very short-sighted. If India had joined any of these military blocs, China would have made a much larger and far more powerful aggression upon India long before. It is only because of our most friendly relations with Russia that we have been saved twice from the hands of China. It is not the question whether China would win or India would

lose in that sort of armed conflict; but it is sure that America would have stepped into the arena to help us in fighting China to the ruin of India only because neither America nor China would have lost much in the contest. Both Britain and America want that India should be the war theatre in any conflict between the Capitalist countries and the Communist countries.

Nehru looked at another equally important international problem with the same caution and circumspection, namely, the problem of China being a member of the United Nations. India had been voting always for the membership of China in the United Nations; but China has been very clever throughout in avoiding the United Nations so that she could carry on her aggressive expansionist programme in the East without any impediment. It is because of this sinister motive of China that Russia particularly is very much alert, and that she is coming much nearer to India so that India may ultimately turn into a Communist country or may join hands with Russia in the event of an armed conflict between Russia and China. Even now India, Russia, America and Britain—all are trying to bring China under the United Nations so that China's military madness or her lust for power can be duly curbed. So, we find that Nehru always made a scientific approach to every international problem, and he always took also a practical view of it. That is why, Nehru's successor, Shastri, is following very closely his predecessor's ideal and policy.

We Must March with the Times :

Nehru used to say that whenever we have to solve any national or international problem we must keep in view the trends of the time otherwise we shall wrongly solve the problem and create a lot of troubles for ourselves as well as for others. For example, when Britain had a number of colonies in the East she always tried to retain her hold on them by suppression and oppression of the budding spirit of independence in them. Nehru's advice to Britain would have been as it was Gandhi's advice to Britain with regard to India that Britain should have considered that no country, no race in the world can be held in thralldom for eternity. Britain should not have forgotten that she too was under Norman conquest and was

also under French power for several years but then neither Italy nor France could hold Britain long in thralldom. In the case of the Portuguese and French dependencies in India, France was much wiser than Portugal (Spain) in surrendering Pondicherry and Chandar Nagar to the Indian Union soon after the Britishers had quitted our land. It was because Portugal refused to march with the times that is why she had to fight with the budding spirit of independence in the citizens of Goa, Daman and Diu leading to much of unnecessary bloodshed on both sides. In the same way, Africa is now trying to be awake with the spirit of liberation of her population that had been long in thralldom under the jackboots of the various European, Arabian and other countries in the West and the East. It should be the policy of the United Nations, according to Nehru's principle or policy, that all the States of Africa—small or big—should be helped in their liberation movement, and not that any of the powerful countries should try to exploit these backward States further on the pretext of their liberation.

Regarding some of the national problems of India such as the problem of the untouchables, the problem of the minority communities, the problem of divorce, the problem of the purdah or the emancipation of women, Nehru used to tell us that we must try to shed off our religious, social and other prejudices which are all time-honoured and outmoded conventions, customs or usages because we have got to march with the times or rather with the progressive nations that do not observe the purdah, the caste system, the indissolubility of the marriage contract or any other convention of life which we Indians—whether Hindus or Muslims—still rigidly observe. There decades ago, both the Hindu and the Muslim women were strictly confined behind the purdah, and very few of them used to have any kind of education or any other form of liberty or privilege which the women in America or in Europe have been enjoying for several centuries past. Nehru used to point out that Indian women, like the American or the European women, have as much the right of free movement, of education, of vote, and of divorce and remarriage, and hence, if we deprive our women of any of these privileges or rather birthrights we would be doing them the greatest wrong and the cruellest injury.

Mutual Adjustment and Cooperation :

Nehru used to say that while going to solve a problem or to settle a national or international dispute, mutual adjustment and cooperation or mutual sacrifice and conciliation is absolutely necessary. By force or by mere arguments one can never settle any dispute or solve any problem. But the question is if one party is comparatively weak while the other party is comparatively strong, the weaker party alone will have to make the sacrifice or will have to take the initiative for conciliation otherwise force is very likely to be used by the strong party. In such a case, no scientific approach can help the situation any way. But in such cases, Nehru would interpret or explain 'scientific approach' in another manner. He would say that scientific approach means circumspective approach, or in other words, it means that when conciliation fails to solve a particular problem, force remains to perform the task ; but when force fails, nothing remains to settle the dispute ; and hence, in the case of weak, defenceless and resourceless countries, it is always advisable to settle international disputes by conciliation otherwise the disputes will remain unsettled or become graver and more acute with the lapse of time. Take, for example, the dispute of Kashmir between India and Pakistan, or the boundary dispute between India and China. Pakistan shall have to admit that she is a much smaller and weaker country than India, and India also will have to admit that she is not as strong as China in population, in science and industries, in military equipments or resources. So, according to Nehru, what should be the policy or attitude of Pakistan towards the Kashmir problem, and also what should be India's manner of settling the border dispute with China ? Pakistan dared invade Kashmir simply because she was backed by China or instigated by Britain or helped indirectly by America with vast quantities of arms and ammunition which America wanted ofcourse to be used against China and not against India. But how did China dare attack India in 1962, knowing full well that America was perfectly ready to pounce upon China at the slightest hint from India ? Or did China bank upon the idea that if America came into the arena to fight against China, Russia being a sister Communist country would also step into the arena to defend China

against America ? China banked not only upon the support of Russia but also on the hope that America would never actively participate in any armed conflict between China and India because it would then lead positively to a nuclear war which both Russia and America have been avoiding so far out of the fear of mutual destruction or annihilation. So, China has been so far taking an undue advantage of the whole situation and has been threatening India with an all-out war. Ofcourse, it is most uncertain if China can win a war against India inspite of China's militarized population or her mechanised arms and ammunition. China should know that if she is not helped by Russia through the backdoor, India can positively win a war against China even if she is in collusion with Pakistan. But then, our question was and still is, how to solve the problem of Kashmir with Pakistan or the border problem between India and China. According to Gandhi's advice, we should better surrender atleast a part of Kashmir to Pakistan, while on the other hand, we should conciliate with China by surrendering whatever uninhabitable and sterile regions on our Northern frontier China would demand ! Ofcourse, if China's demand is unreasonable, dishonourable and impracticable, India has no other alternative but to accept China's challenge for a war.

Nehru, least of all other persons in India, wanted any dishonourable or humiliating settlement of any international problem on behalf of India ; and that is why, he had spent so much of Indian money, Indian life, and other Indian resources on the preservation of the territorial integrity of Kashmir for the last eighteen years. We are sure that Shastri as well as our Parliament will never agree to any partition of Kashmir or any surrender of an inch of land of Kashmir because Kashmir for the last eighteen years has been an integral part of the Indian Union, and as such, she can never be separated from India by any international authority in the world. Nehru had made all possible scientific approach to the problem of Kashmir but Pakistan was never ready for any amicable or honourable settlement ; and that is why, India has got to be always alert against Pakistan and China both of which countries seem to be incorrigibly treacherous. Pakistan has already betrayed

America by using America's arms and ammunition against India and not against China ; she has betrayed America further more vitally by joining hands with China particularly when Pakistan is a member of the United Nations' Security Council and also of the SEATO and CENTO, and China is the greatest enemy of U.S.A.

QUESTIONS

1. Comment : -
"Nehru had trusted Pakistan too much."
2. Discuss :—
"If a big country like America can commit the blunder entrusting arms and ammunition to the hands of Pakistan, how could Nehru be so much in the wrong when he trusted both Pakistan and China particularly when none of them had ever shown their concealed dagger at the back of India."
3. "China can never be a friend to India."
Discuss.
4. Explain :—
"Both Russia and America have the same axe to grind in Asia."
5. "India's interest should be in being on friendly terms with both U.S.A. and U.S.S.R." Discuss.
6. Describe Nehru's Scientific Approach to the problem of India's relations with U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. ?
7. What ways did Nehru suggest as Scientific Approach to different sorts of problems ?
8. How did Nehru approach to the national and international problems ?
9. Discuss Nehru's reactions to the banning of nuclear weapons.
10. Discuss Nehru's approach regarding desirability of the United Nations or the Commonwealth of Nations.
11. How was his thinking different from other critics ?

12. "Many people have said that Nehru was a visionary or a dreamer, and not much of a practical man."
Discuss.
 13. Why did Nehru not join the SEATO or the CENTO ?
 14. "If anybody says, Nehru did the wrong thing by keeping aloof from military pacts or alliances, he must be very short-sighted."
Discuss.
 15. How was Nehru very wise in asking India to vote always for China's membership in the United Nations ?
 16. Discuss how Nehru's successor, Shastri, is following very closely his predecessor's ideal and policy.
 17. "Nehru used to say that whenever we have to solve any national or international problem we must keep in view the trends of the time otherwise we shall wrongly solve the problem and create a lot of troubles for ourselves as well as for others."
Discuss the truth of the statement by quoting examples.
 18. Discuss how Nehru solved the problem of untouchability, the problem of the minority communities, the problem of divorce, the problem of the purdah or the emancipation of women.
 19. "Nehru used to say that while going to solve a problem or to settle a national or international dispute, mutual adjustment and co-operation or mutual sacrifice and conciliation is absolutely necessary."
Discuss the justification of this outlook.
 20. Why Nehru did not like to make use of the "force" in settling the Kashmir dispute with Pakistan ?
 21. "India has got to be always alert against Pakistan and China both of which countries are incorrigibly treacherous."
Discuss giving examples.
-

CHAPTER V

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

No Narrow or Orthodox Nationalism :—

Both nationalism and internationalism were the ideal of Nehru. He was a nationalist in the sense that he loved his mother country, his own country men, and the culture of his motherland with all their deficiencies. He never said that he was not an Indian ; he never acknowledged that his mother tongue was inferior to any other language in the world ; he always loved to go in his native dress and also to eat and drink in the same manner as all his countrymen loved to do. Nehru was an internationalist also in the sense that he loved all human beings, all the virtues of other peoples belonging to the 'East or the West, and he never hated any body unless he was a coward or an orthodox or prejudiced creature, unless he was fallen and degraded in the nobler or finer qualities of human nature which alone make a person enviable or worthy of respect in the eyes of the world. Nehru was an internationalist in the sense that he believed in world cooperation, world unity, world harmony, world prosperity, world happiness and world peace. Nehru never felt happy if he found any country being down-trodden or humiliated or exploited in any manner. He could not tolerate the narrowness of nationalism or the conspiracy of internationalism against the weak and defenceless countries of the world. His idea of nationalism was quite different from other peoples' notion of it. Mark what he says, "Nationalism, ofcourse, is a curious phenomenon which at a certain stage in a country's history gives life, growth, strength and unity but, at the same time, it has a tendency to limit one, because one thinks of one's country as something different from the rest of the world. The perspective changes, and one is continuously thinking of one's own struggles and virtues and failings to the exclusion of

other thoughts. The result is that the same nationalism, which is the symbol of growth for a people, becomes a symbol of the cessation of that growth in the mind. Nationalism, when it becomes successful, sometimes goes on spreading in an aggressive way and becomes a danger internationally. Whatever line of thought you follow, you arrive at the conclusion that some kind of balance must be found. Otherwise something that was good can turn into evil."

Nehru was always afraid of national prejudice, national conservatism and national fanaticism, which do not carry a country anywhere except to her own isolation from other countries and slowly and gradually to her permanent degradation in every sphere. No nation in the world can say boldly that she is the most self-sufficient nation in the world or that she is superior to all other nations in light and culture, science and industries, religion and philosophy and in every other respect so far she can be judged by her material progress and prosperity. Nehru has pointed out to us times without number and has also warned us against the pitfalls of nationalism which have not only been the bane of India but also of great countries like Britain, France and Germany. These days China is suffering from the madness of nationalism to which she has given a new colour—the colour of militarism in which she is pitching all her dreams of world supremacy just as Germany did in 1914 or in 1939 during the last two world wars. Nehru has explained the narrowness of nationalism to which every country more or less plays the fool or the victim. Mark his words, "Almost every country in the world believes that it has some special dispensation from Providence, that it is of the chosen people or race and that others, whether they are good or bad, are somewhat inferior creatures. It is extraordinary how this kind of feeling persists in all nations of the East as well as of the West without exception. The nations of the East are strongly entrenched in their own ideas and convictions, and sometimes, in their own sense of superiority about certain matters. Anyhow, in the course of the last two or three hundred years, they have received many knocks on the head, and they have been humiliated, they have been debased, and they have been exploited. And so, in spite of their feeling that they were forced to admit that they could be knocked about and exploited.

To some extent, this brought a sense of realism to them. There was also an attempt to escape from reality by saying that it was sad that we were not so advanced in material and technical things but that these were after all superficial things ; nevertheless, we were superior in essential things, in spiritual things and in moral values. I have no doubt that spiritual things and moral values are ultimately more important than other things, but the way one finds escape in the thought that one is spiritually superior, simply because one is inferior in a material and physical sense, is surprising. It does not follow by any means. It is an escape from facing up to the causes of one's degradation."

Understanding of Human Relations :

Very often Nehru talked of human relations and international understanding. But what did he mean by human relations or international understanding ? By human relations, not only Nehru but everybody means the social, political, economic and cultural relations, not only between human individuals in the family or in any particular society or community but among the various races and nations all over the world. The modern age is the age when every human relation should be considered from the international point of view otherwise man will have to return to the prehistoric stage of isolation of one group of human beings from any other group. So, the question of human relations has arisen ever since internationalism has come into the political field which has again been closely associated with the economic, social and cultural activities of human beings in any part of the world.

When Nehru talked of human relations he had in view the question of international relations and international understanding. The modern world has become much smaller than before because the various peoples of the world have come much closer to one another than fifty years ago. This closeness of human relations has been brought about by the various ways and means of modern transport and communication, and because of this closeness two problems have arisen in the modern world—the problem of good international understanding and the problem of international misunderstanding, each of which has its far-reaching effects upon the various nations

of the world. If there were no fastest aeroplanes, no steam engines, no telephone or no wireless in any part of the world there would have been no close contact between the races and the nations, there would have been no violent aggression in any part of the world for exploitation and tyranny as we are finding now-a-days. In the near future, the space communications will probably further complicate human relations and international understanding.

Nehru while talking of human relations and international understanding pointed out to us that just as no human being can live alone (even the animals or the birds or small creations cannot live alone) atleast now-a-days when such huge human masses are being constantly brought into the closest touch with one another, it is a matter of great importance to study the psychology, the ways of living, the aspirations, the limitations, the virtues and points of excellence and strength of most other human beings who live far and near. If the English people had not ruled over us for one hundred and fifty years, could we ever come to know anything of the world abroad—the sciences, the industries, the technologies and so many other things which came into being in Europe or in America? If there had been no World War of 1914 or of 1939, could Russia or America advance so much and so quickly in the invention of the nuclear weapons? Many of us probably do not know that Germany during Hitler had much advanced in intercontinental ballistic missiles the benefit of which Russia and America fully reaped from the German scientists after the termination of the hostilities. Similarly, Japan could never have made such a tremendous advance as she did during the second and the third decades of the present century, nor could China become such a formidable country, if Japan had not come into closest touch with America or Great Britain, or if China had not availed herself of the financial, scientific, industrial and technological aid from Russia. Even India could not have been what she is today had not Nehru got in closest touch with America and all other progressive countries of Europe. Many people who are short-sighted blame Nehru after his death that he had done nothing to India during his long regime of eighteen years. But these people have no eyes, and if they had any, they could have seen in broad daylight what Nehru has done for

his country. Who has built up so many development projects? Who has secured so much of foreign financial aid? Who has brought India to such a close contact with most of the leading countries in the world? Who has created such a friendly atmosphere between India and Russian or America or any other country in the East or the West? Who did organise the Afro-Asian bloc? Who did give the lead to the Commonwealth of Nations? Who did inspire India and many other Afro-Asian countries to be members of the United Nations? It was none but Nehru who understood the real significance of human relations and also the great value of international understanding. It is because of the lack of proper international understanding that there is yet so much of racial hatred, national prejudice, and all sorts of exploitation and tyranny are still going on in many parts of the world. If Nehru were alive, we are sure, he could have solved the problem of Vietnam, the problem of Rhodesia, even the problem of Kashmir and our border dispute with China.

Cooperation Between Nations :

The thought of human relations and international understanding led Nehru to the thought of cooperation between nations. By international cooperation Nehru never meant the formation of power blocs which unfortunately is the way of most of the leading nations. Nehru was very much against all power blocs. In his eyes, the power blocs were nothing but international gangs of conspiracy for human exploitation and tyranny. The power blocs never help any real international understanding or cooperation, but on the other hand, they inflame the spirit of rivalry, hatred and enmity between the various nations. The Commonwealth of Nations and the United Nations are regarded as nothing but power blocs organised and sponsored by Britain and America in which, ofcourse, Russia is merely a spectator or sometimes a deterrent agent to any programme of the capitalist countries against the communist countries. Knowing all these facts, Nehru preferred to stay within these two orbits, not as a mere satellite as many of the smaller member nations of the two organisations are in reality, but as a close observer of the currents and intercurrents of world affairs from which India cannot afford to be dissociated.

Nobody else in India except Nehru had the privilege of studying and understanding so correctly international relations and international politics. We are unfortunately much behind-hand in this respect; and that is why, after the death of Nehru, India has been so much misunderstood even by some of her friendly countries. Nehru had the uncanny power of insight as well as of foresight which very few of us really possess. Nehru's extraordinary power of insight as well as of foresight helped him a good deal in knowing the psychology behind all kinds of international political games, as the result of which he could come to know what the leading nations or rather the great power blocs were about; and thus he could immediately adjust himself and his country to the blowing wind and reap the maximum benefit out of it. All the big world politicians knew Nehru's calibre as well as his magnetic personality. We have noticed how Kennedy, Khrushchev, Chou-en-Lai, Tito, and other world personalities on the international chessboard used to acknowledge Nehru's superiority in the matter of understanding the correct psychology of nations. They also acknowledged Nehru's world vision, and above all, his great humanity for which alone Nehru should live in the hearts of mankind as long as Mahatma Gandhi.

Nehru's idea about cooperation between nations dawned in him particularly when India became politically independent and he became the helmsman of the new Republic. Nehru did not believe in military alliance with other nations because he considered military alliance as nothing but a secret pact for aggression; but on the other hand, he believed in all sorts of international alliances for the development and enlightenment of the backward races and countries. For example, he believed in the World Health Organisation, in the World Food Organisation, in the World Scientific, Ethical and Cultural Organisation but he never believed in any of the world territorial defence organisations such as the SEATO, CENTO and NATO. He did not believe in the race of armaments—conventional or nuclear—which he considered as the race for destruction and annihilation. His great ideal was to raise humanity from poverty, ill-health, illiteracy, ignorance and prejudice or superstition, for all of which noble programmes of work he needed the cooperation of other countries and nations that

have been able to conquer or remove some of these great ills of human life. Nehru was not merely a great politician but he was also a great philosopher, a great humanitarian ; and that is why, his ideal was to save mankind from the repeated armed conflicts between nations as also to make his own country as well as all other countries of the world happier, healthier and wealthier than they have been hitherto.

Avoidance of Armed Conflicts :

It was Gandhi who always believed in the peaceful settlement of all kinds of national or international disputes or problems ; naturally, Nehru and all of us who are disciples of Gandhi believe in non-violence and a peaceful settlement of all affairs. But then, Nehru pointed out that the chief cause of an armed conflict is the lust for power or for wealth which we can find more or less in all countries whichever have grown a little prosperous and powerful. If India says that she has no lust for power or wealth, it means that she is still weak and backward or undeveloped in science, industries and technology. We the followers of Gandhi cannot be like our Guru, and naturally, most of us are greedy, ambitious, jealous, proud and also most of us probably believe in war or violence or armament. Nehru could not be an exception ; but then, he never liked unnecessary violence, bloodshed, war and destruction of life and property, probably because he had seen the devastations made by the last two world wars from which he must have learnt the lesson that war is a positive evil whether man can avoid it or not. Nehru being a disciple of Gandhi believed sincerely that there cannot be any such international problem or dispute in the world which cannot be settled peacefully by diplomacy, negotiation and non-violence. Nehru's idea is that if war is avoided, it must be avoided by all means ; but if it is unavoidable, it must be fought to a finish. Nehru's argument is that formerly, war was not so destructive as now-a-days because of the most deadly and devastating nuclear weapons—atom bomb, hydrogen bomb, nitrogen bomb, and so many other missiles which can wipe out more than half the human population of the world in a few minutes. Ofcourse, Nehru knew quite well as we also know it that no nuclear power is going to use any of the unclear weapons in any war ; but then, if there be any mad man at the head of any country

as there is one or probably there are many such lunatics in China who, when they are armed with any nuclear weapon, would not hesitate for a moment to use such weapons without thinking for a moment that other countries who have become already nuclear powers would also use the same devastating weapons in self-defence. How can then China or Russia or America or any other country, whether nuclear or non-nuclear, escape from the devastations which will be wrought by both the parties on each other? Nuclear war has been avoided so far only on account of the dread of mutual devastation. But then, Mao Tse-tung believes that every country, for all times to come, will fight with conventional weapons and not with nuclear weapons, out of sheer dread of the nuclear weapons, and that is why, he is not afraid of America or Russia or any other nuclear power. But then, may we ask why China is doing all her best in order to prepare the atom bomb and other such devastating weapons? Mao Tse-tung will probably say in reply, "We too want to be a paper tiger with nuclear teeth." But in our opinion, if any country ever triggers off a nuclear war, it will be China and no other country because China has gone completely mad with her militarism and also because she has built up a foolish theory that it is not weapons (arms and ammunition) but men (soldiers) who fight and win the war. There can not be any more stupid theory than this: and that is why, we fear that China or rather Mao Tse-Tung, like Hitler, is born for the destruction of Asia. Nehru many a time, after China's treacherous and unprovoked aggression upon India, said that unless Russia puts under least this mad or rabid dog, or America cripples or shoots down the mad dog, very bad days are waiting for Asia, if not for Europe or America unless, ofcourse, Russia gets herself involved in the conflict while defending her biggest communist sister, in which case neither Europe nor America can escape the devastation.

Nehru pointed out the error of the United Nations to have organised so many defence blocs and to have built up so many military bases (nuclear and non-nuclear) all around the world. Nehru pointed out also to America and Britain that it was not fair for a world organisation, of which Russia also is a permanent member, to build so many military bases in order

to put an effective check upon Russia and China or rather upon all the Communist Countries, which, in the eyes of the Capitalist Countries are the greatest enemy. Should not China and Russia also argue in the same way that America and Britain are the greatest enemies to the working class or the common people of the world? Nehru pointed out indefensible position of these power blocs that harmony or peace cannot be established in the world by violence or terror, but it can be positively achieved by peaceful negotiation and arguments. But who would listen to Nehru or Gandhi? That is why, we fear, the whole world is heading towards devastation, ruin and annihilation sooner or later. Bertrand Russell, the other day pointed out, like Nehru, that so much of money (millions of dollars) is being wasted every day in manufacturing the nuclear weapons, why should not America and Russia invest all those huge amounts in some constructive and useful projects for the service of humanity, for the alleviation of poverty, illiteracy, ignorance, prejudice, superstition, ill-health, disease, and all sorts of vices and crimes in all parts of the world? Both Nehru and Bertrand Russell have said that the human world is particularly interested in destruction, degradation, retrogression, and annihilation but not in progress, advancement, prosperity, harmony, happiness and peace. It is a strange irony that all the big powers talk of disarmament but all of them are vigorously manufacturing arms and ammunition and the nuclear weapons, and at the same time, enhancing their armed forces. And not only that, but all these big powers are preaching peace and harmony and at the same time, they are carrying on armed hostilities in Africa and Asia. Pakistan would never have dared to make such a surprise attack on India had she not got such huge quantities of arms and ammunition from America and Britain. India also got some quantities of war material from these countries but she has never misused them as Pakistan has done. China in the same way received much of scientific, technological, and financial aid from Russia for building up her military power; but then, the world knows how China, like Pakistan, is misusing all assets by creating a split between herself and her mother communist country. China has now become ravenous with her greed for power; she wants to dominate Asia because she is going to direct all her armed

forces against India, Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and even Pakistan although she has been professing lip-friendliness to Pakistan since 1962 when she made a surprise attack on India.

Exchange of Cultural Thoughts between Nations :

Nehru was himself a highly cultured man who belonged to the country which dates back her philosophy and culture at least three thousand years ago when Britain and America were either unborn or passing through their prehistoric stage. Indians believe in culture, and particularly, in spiritual culture although they may be very much backward in material progress. Nehru like most of us used to believe that if all the nations of the world could be raised to the same high level of culture, much of the misunderstanding, quarrel, strife and war, much of the exploitation and tyranny, which we find in the modern world, would have been considerably reduced or removed. It was Nehru who first suggested to all the progressive countries of the world to hold cultural conferences, of which UNESCO is the greatest organisation, in the various centres of the world, and also to exchange cultural missions between the various nations with a view to create a proper international understanding so that all sorts of prejudices and fanaticisms like racialism and nationalism, Communism and Socialism and various sorts of other political and economic cults may cease to exercise their evil influence upon mankind, and at the same time produce a climate or atmosphere of cooperation, friendliness, and amity.

Nehru always fought for human freedom, world unity, world harmony and world peace ; and he believed sincerely that all these things can be achieved by a frequent exchange of cultural thoughts and missions between the various nations.

Settlement of International Disputes by a representative World Authority :—

Nehru enquired very deeply into the various causes of all kinds of important international disputes, and he found out the following causes :—

- (a) Lust for Power and wealth.
- (b) Jealousy and rivalry.

- (c) Competition in trade and commerce.
- (d) Undue exploitation of human labour by the capitalists.
- (e) Racialism and nationalism.
- (f) Undue expansion of armaments.
- (g) Explosive population.
- (h) Unequal distribution of the natural resources in the various countries.

So far lust for power and wealth is concerned. it is not necessarily the poorer or the weaker countries that are greedy of wealth and power ; on the other hand, it has been seen in human history that whichever nation grew comparatively powerful and wealthy, she wanted to grow more powerful and wealthier. This greed for power and wealth can never be curbed or cured unless and until human nature is radically changed. We do not think that any body on earth can radically change human nature or character by merely preaching sermons on self-denial, temperance and self-sacrifice. If the individual human being can not forget his passion for power or wealth, how can a nation forget its collective passion for the same ?

So far jealousy and rivalry are concerned, if they are directed for the achievement of good things, they should not be regarded as vices ; but then unfortunately, when most of us do not possess certain things, we want to capture them by hook or by crook, and that becomes a vice or a crime in the ordinary code of ethics or law. Jealousy and rivalry can be to some extent reduced by removing the abnormal disparities between nations in industrial, scientific, technological, agricultural and other forms of material progress just as we can cure to a great extent the antagonism between capital and labour by paying better wages or giving more amenities of life to the working class than what they usually enjoy. America has been following a wrong policy in the backward countries by lending financial aid to them for the development of various projects instead of suggesting to these backward countries that they should pay better wages to their working class for a better living.

Competition in trade and commerce should always be encouraged but monopolistic tendencies of modern industries and commerce should be curbed in order to widen the scope of competition in trade, industries and commerce by which alone the wealth of a country can increase and the happiness of the people may be ensured. Undue exploitation of human labour by the capitalists will grow more and more acute with the development of the various industries, trade and commerce. But then, there may be a considerable relief to the hardship and misery of the working class if the capitalists agree to accept lesser returns of the various investments of their capital. But then, will the Capitalists agree to be satisfied with less when they can get more? That is why, the monster of Communism has shown its hideous face ever since the industrial workshops, mills and factories came into existence. It is very very doubtful if the strife between Capital and Labour can ever disappear from the human world so long man is prosperous, strong and alive.

Many of the international disputes of the earlier centuries in every part of the world used to arise out of racialism and nationalism; but then, with the gradual advance of science, light and culture the world is trying to forget racialism and nationalism. We are coming to realise slowly and gradually that purity of race is a fiction, and so also is the very theory of nationhood or nationalism, for the simple reason that all races are a great admixture of blood coming from various stocks or streams, and all nations are nothing but accidental groups of human beings thrown by Nature within certain geographical boundaries. But then sometimes in an age of light and culture, science and industries, the madness of racialism and nationalism crops up and creates all sorts of bad blood and hostilities in various parts of the world. Hitler, for example, used to claim that the Germans are the pure Aryans and they are as such a race of supermen, and therefore, they have the right to rule over all countries and all races. The English people also for a number of centuries developed a similar superiority complex, and that is why, they used to hate all the Eastern races and nations of the world. The Americans probably now-a-days fancy that by virtue of their wealth and material progress they are also a race of supermen and gods, and that is why, Russia, Germany,

France, Italy, India, Japan are all races of an inferior breed, and as such they are fit only to be exploited and looked down upon. China recently developed a very strong and pernicious complex of superiority in militarism and man-power, and that is why, America, which suffers from a similar complex, is preparing for a mortal combat with the Chinese dragon. So, unless we shed off these complexes of national or racial superiority over others, the world can never have any peace.

Then again, to exhibit one's power as well as to feed one's unusual greed for wealth and power, the bigger nations are expanding their armaments in all directions. This race in armament is one of the most dangerous symptoms of a sudden flare-up of a world conflagration in the form of a nuclear war. But how can the race be stopped unless some considerable section of the human population be wiped out from the face of the earth? Bertrand Russell has predicted that by the end of this century, the pre-historic age of man will return or rather instead of human beings we will find on the earth's surface, not the animals and the birds, not even the snakes and the reptiles nor even the vestige of forests but only scorched lands and deserts, and, ofcourse, mountains, rivers and seas or oceans which will reign supreme instead of mankind.

Explosive population and unequal distribution of the natural resources may often be the cause of armed conflicts between nations. When there is an explosive population in a country and when that country is limited in space and also comparatively poor, such a country can not but look to other grounds for pasture and shelter as China is now-a-days doing in order to feed her hungry millions and provide them with shelter. The only remedy for explosive population is family planning. Bertrand Russell has struck a terror into the hearts of the Americans and the Europeans by correctly warning the western nations against the explosive population not only of China but also of India and all the Far Eastern countries. He has said that by the end of the present century, the population of the East will completely swamp the population of the West in which hemisphere there will be more of children and old people than of fullgrown young men and women. He has further warned the western

world that there will be such a scarcity of food all over the world after sixty or seventy years that those who are stronger numerically will succeed in snatching away from the mouths which are numerically weaker. Last of all, he has predicted that the western world having reached the climax of their power and prosperity in the present century, it will be the turn of Africa and Asia to rise above America and Africa in every field of material progress, power and prosperity.

Nehru suggested to all the nations of the world that the best way of settling all international problems or disputes is to refer them to some world authority which must be representative in character and also sufficiently powerful to enforce its decree or decision upon the disputant nations or parties. Nehru always thought of a world organisation, a world authority, a world tribunal, a world government which should represent all the big a small nations of the world and which should be able to pool and command all the resources, all the armed forces, all the collective will and determination of the various countries or nations so that no disputant party will have the nerve or courage or power to disobey the judgment or the decree of that world authority. One such world authority has been organised under the name of the United Nations, but unless it embraces or represents all the nations of the world, and unless this world organisation ceases to be a mere power bloc it can never serve the purpose which Nehru pleaded or desired. As a matter of fact, the present United Nations has failed in settling any of the international disputes so far simply because the United Nations is not a representative body in reality, but on the other hand, it is a kind of "a packed Jury" which is not interested in justice or peace of the world but interested only in the furtherance of the interests of a few countries whichever they may be. We are seeing before our very eyes how the Security Council of the United Nations has not had the courage to declare Pakistan as the aggressor when Pakistan raided Jammu and Kashmir on the 5th. of August, 1965, nor had it the courage to take seriously to task when Pakistan abused the vast quantities of American arms and ammunition which America supplied to Pakistan on the express understanding that they would be used against China or Russia

whoever happened to attack our sub-continent. Then again, when Bhutto, Pakistan's Foreign Minister, threatened the General Assembly of the United Nations to quit the Organisation if Kashmir was not handed over to Pakistan, or when Bhutto on the very floor of the General Assembly called the Indian delegation by the most vulgar and abusive name of "a pack of dogs", the United Nations did not have the courage to kick out such a rabid puppy. How can the smaller and the weaker nations of the world have any faith or trust in such a timid or inequitable world organisation?

QUESTIONS

1. In what sense, Nehru was a 'nationalist'?
2. How was Nehru an 'internationalist'?
3. Discuss the pitfalls of nationalism?
4. "China is suffering from the madness of nationalism to which she has given a new colour—the colour of militarism."

Discuss.

5. "Nehru has explained the narrowness of nationalism to which every country, more or less, plays the fool or the victim."

Discuss in reference to Germany of 1914 and 1943, China of 1962 and 1966, and Pakistan of 1965.

6. "We were superior in essential things, in spiritual things and in moral values."

Discuss and justify.

7. Explain what Nehru meant by 'human relations' or 'international understanding'.
8. Describe what Nehru has done for his country.
9. "To Nehru, the power blocs were nothing but international gangs of conspiracy for human exploitation and tyranny."

Discuss.

10. "The Commonwealth of Nations and the United Nations

are regarded as nothing but power blocs organised and sponsored by Britain and America in which, of course, Russia is merely a spectator ”

Discuss.

11. Why Nehru wanted India to remain as a member of the Commonwealth or that of the United Nations ? Discuss.
12. “Nehru had the uncanny power of insight as well as of foresight.”
Discuss how these powers helped Nehru to understand international political games.
13. Explain how Kennedy, Khrushchev, Chou-en-Lai, Tito, and other world personalities on the international chess-board acknowledged Nehru’s superiority in understanding the correct psychology of nations.
14. Discuss Nehru’s ideal of co-operation between world nations.
15. Why Nehru did not believe in military alliance with other nations ?
16. Expand : —
“His great ideal was to raise humanity from poverty, ill-health, illiteracy, ignorance and prejudice or superstition.”
17. Why Nehru did not believe in unnecessary violence, bloodshed, war and destruction of life and property ?
18. “Mao Tse-tung, like Hitler, is born for the destruction of Asia.”
Discuss
19. Nehru, many a time, said :—
“Unless Russia puts under leash this mad or rabid dog (China), very bad days are waiting for Asia.”
Discuss, why and how ?
20. Nehru pointed out the error of the United Nations to have organised so many defence blocs and to have built up so many military bases (nuclear and non-nuclear) all around the world.

Discuss how the building of military-bases was an error ?

21. "Nehru believed that harmony or peace cannot be achieved in the world by violence or terror."

Discuss Nehru's belief in the achievement of World Peace.

22. Discuss Nehru's role in the holding of cultural conferences to create mutual understanding and good-will in the world. How far has his suggestion achieved this project ?

23. Enumerate the various causes which Nehru discovered that led to international disputes ?

24. "The purity of race is a fiction and so also is the theory of nationhood or nationalism."

Discuss Nehru's views on the subject.

25. "Unless we shed off the complexes of national or racial superiority over others, the world can never have any peace." Discuss.

26. How are the explosive population and unequal distribution of the natural resources, the cause of armed conflicts between nations ?

27. What was Nehru's suggestion for settling international problems or disputes ?

28. "The United Nations is not a representative body in reality, but on the other hand, it is a kind of 'a packed Jury.'" Discuss.

— — — —

CHAPTER VI

DEMOCRATIC WAY OF LIFE

What is Democracy ?

Every body quotes the words of Abraham Lincoln whenever he goes to define democracy, which in the words of Abraham Lincoln is a government of the people by the people, and for the people. The other day, President Johnson of America, while having a talk with President Ayub of Pakistan, remarked about democracy as a government by the people and for the people ; but why he omitted the remaining words — 'of the people' — we can not explain. Probably President Johnson meant that democracy is not a government of the people in the sense the communists use the term 'people' by which they mean the common people or the working class. Did President Johnson want to hit the communist countries because Pakistan was in collusion with China, while India is on friendly terms with Russia ? Well, great people always speak in great riddles with which the common people should have no concern.

Nehru was a great democrat ; he was also a great socialist but nothing of a communist. If Khrushchev were not thrown out of his office and if Nehru were not dead, any of them would have converted the other into his own creed, and nobody knows if Nehru would have been a communist or Khrushchev would have turned into a democratic socialist. Democracy has now become a very funny term in politics just as communism has ceased to be an economic cult and has become a through-going political stunt. Democracy like communism has become the creed of opportunism, favouritism, backdoor nepotism, because in the name of democracy and communism such atrocious crimes are being committed in broad daylight such as military aggression in the name of liberation, nuclear armament in the name of world peace, territorial defence organisations in the name of justice and harmony, and such many

other nonsense and absurdities which the weaker undemocratic countries have to swallow and which the stronger democratic countries are forcing down the throats of the poor defenceless nations ! Our Nehru, of course, did not believe in such a pattern of democracy.

No Dictatorship, No Autocracy :

No democrat can tolerate any kind of dictatorship or autocracy. Autocracy or dictatorship can be maintained only by force, while democracy can be maintained by the inborn sense of justice and fairness which is expected to be in every adult person. Democracy is amenable to reason and arguments, while autocracy or dictatorship listens only to doggedness or obstinacy which is also in every man just as there is reason or argument in him. Dictatorship or autocracy is possible in a country where majority of the people are illiterate, intellectually backward, ignorant and superstitious ; but wherever there is any light of culture, any development of science and industries, the people are found to be mostly intelligent, enlightened, and inclined to listen to reason or arguments in any affair or problem. Nehru was educated in a country (England) which was the birthplace of democracy, and naturally, although he was bred and brought up in a country (India) where dictatorship or autocracy of every kind had ruled previous to British rule yet he imbibed the true spirit of democracy. He could not tolerate autocracy or dictatorship even in the family or in society or in administration or legislation in any sphere. He used to say and also practise in his own life, "Every body at the age of maturity should do just as he thinks right, and not just as he is dictated by the superiors--whether parents, teachers, priests or leaders in any field." According to Nehru, democracy means individual freedom subject to social, national and human welfare. But then, most people want to take the law in their own hand and act in accordance with their own convenience or interest, just as the Communists are now-a-days doing. Ofcourse, the communists are not free individuals but just like mechanical tools or automatons who are guided and impelled by the cult which they call Marxism or Leninism. Nehru meant to say that the spirit of democracy is in every human being or even in every animal or bird, because every

living creature on earth wants to do just as it likes ; but then, independent individual action may come into clash with the action of similar other creatures of the same species and may produce disharmony and chaos to guard against which some amount of self-discipline or self-restraint is necessary; and when one has been able to think, feel and act, not entirely out of self-interest but also out of consideration of the welfare of the many or of all, he can be regarded as a true democrat. Nehru was a democrat in this sense only. In the modern world, particularly in a country which has been much advanced in every sphere, if the husband tries to restrict the liberties of his wife, or if the parents want to dictate every action of their children, we are afraid that the wife or the children will definitely hoist their flag of revolt. That is why, the present century is regarded as the truly democratic century, in which there is no room for dictatorship or autocracy of any kind ; and yet we find military dictatorship in Pakistan, Burma, Egypt, China, and in many other small or big countries. What is the cause of this variation ? The real cause is the intellectual backwardness or the lack of national unity in these countries. No body can dream of military dictatorship in Britain, America, France or Russia. But according to certain political thinkers, the communists enjoy no democracy because they are treated as machines or automations that can not have any independent feeling, thinking or willing. No true democrat of today can agree to forego all the liberties of thinking, feeling and willing in his own way ; and therefore, communism like dictatorship or autocracy can never thrive in truly democratic countries. Bertrand Russell has described communism as a form of mass slavery to the State, and that is exactly what it is. In Russia and China if anybody talks against the cult of Marxism or Leninism or if anybody happens to disagree with the autocratic policy of the Communist government he is severely penalised ; but in all free democratic countries there are so many political parties which not only express their notes of dissent but also put up a stiff opposition to many of the actions and policies of their ruling government, and none of these dissenting individuals or parties is penalised in the least, unless ofcourse they take part in any secret or underground subversive activity which may create disturbances in the country

in the form of anarchy or mass revolt.

Freedom of the Press, Speech and Action :

In all democratic countries, there is freedom of the press, speech and action. Ofcourse, it does not mean that any body is privileged to talk any amount of nonsense or to preach sedition or to carry on subversive activities against the ruling government. It does not mean that there is no law and order or discipline in public life, in administration or legislation, or even in private life or domestic circle. In a democratic country there are so many political parties, so many journals and periodicals which advocate views and opinions which may not be at all in agreement with the views and opinions of the ruling party that governs the country. In a democratic country there are so many other organisations which preach and advocate quite the opposite views to those of the government, and yet they are permitted by the government to express such views, and why? Because the aim of democracy is not to choke or stifle the inner spirit of man that contemplates rightly or wrongly the good, the benefit and the welfare of humanity; the aim of democracy, on the other hand, is to develop the full man in every citizen who strives to express himself, to do some good to his society or to his country or to the human race at large. But what is being done in the Communist States or countries? No citizen is allowed to feel that he is a human individual, that he too has his right to express his views on political or other matters, that he also has his noble aspirations, noble thoughts, noble ideals, noble sentiments which may not be necessarily in perfect agreement with the thoughts and views or measures or programmes of administration or legislation of the ruling government. The Communist countries talk of democracy and also follow some of the democratic ways of administration and legislation, and yet it is really very surprising why they try to suppress and oppress the individuality in man and try to convert the citizens, particularly, the working class into an assemblage of mechanical tools or automatons. Did Marx or Lenin suggest that if all men and women are not taught from their childhood to say or believe that two and two make five and not four, that black is not black but it is white, to have no religion or morality or good except the eternal strife

or enmity or hatred towards the Capitalists who are the blood-suckers of the working class or the labourers in the workshops, mills and factories? Nehru did not have any quarrel with Communism except that communism tries to kill the soul in man in order to save his body which is also not saved, because it is subjected to the same hardship and privation, the same servitude and tyranny, the same suffering and misery to which the human body is subjected in all the capitalist but democratic countries.

In Russia and China, the ruling party of the government has its own organ of the press through which it expresses its views and announces its policies. If there be other organs of the press in these two countries they behave more like dummies and give dettos to the official organs of the press. It is really surprising how all the common people in a Communist country—whether they are labourers in the factories and the workshops, or teachers in the educational institutions or clerks and officers in the various offices—take everything lying down sacrificing even their freedom of speech, which is the birth right of every human being. Bertrand Russell and other eminent writers have pointed out that the police and the armed forces in both China and Russia are the most powerful agents of the Communist government, and they gag the mouths of the private press, and exercise a dictatorial authority over all the citizens except over themselves because they are the most highly paid limbs of the government, because they are the most privileged class of the population that enjoy all the comforts, luxuries and liberties of life which none else is permitted to enjoy; and yet the Communist countries try to convince their people that the government is for the working class, of the working class, and by the working class! There cannot be any greater tomfoolery than this.

Government by Parliament and Legislative Assemblies or Councils :

Nehru was a thorough-going democrat who believed not only in the freedom of the press, speech and action but also in maintaining the administration of his country by means of the Parliament and Legislative Assemblies or Councils, because

he knew that without such bodies he could not possibly say or feel at heart that he was doing everything with the consent of the entire population that actually elected their representatives to these legislative bodies. In England they have got the House of Commons and the House of Lords which comprised the British Parliament with, ofcourse, the Sovereign as the head of the Parliament. It is really an anomaly in the British Constitution why there should be any Sovereign at the head of two supreme Legislative bodies ; but as the eminent jurists explain, the British Sovereign is the nominal head just as the king of Japan is the head of the Japanese diet. Whatever may be the interpretation of the convention, there is probably some historical significance behind it. The Britishers probably, due to their long centuries of feudalism in their country, could not do away completely with their ancient idolatry of kingship, and that is why, in order to pay their reverence or worship to that superstitious faith they have still retained their kingship, not as an autocratic or dictatorial head but as a democratic emblem of the supreme temporal authority over their legislative bodies, which jointly go to the making of the British Parliament.

Except after the attainment of political independence India had no Parliament, no legislative assembly or legislative Council during the British rule or the Hindu or the Muslim rule in India. The Parliament and the legislative bodies of India are all an imitation of the British Parliament ; and as a matter of fact, the whole machinery of our administration and legislation has been literally copied from the British model. Nehru himself is an image of the British democrat, and that is why, he used to feel so much at home while conducting the administration of our country in accordance with the British pattern of administration. Ofcourse, both Nehru and ourselves freely acknowledge that the British method of administration and legislation is probably the best in the world probably because the British political constitution is the most democratic political constitution in the world.

But in a country like India where there is only fifteen per cent literacy and where ninety per cent of the people are extremely poor, and where also the educated and the uneducated people are equally indifferent to politics or political life,

and above all, where most people are simpletons or fools, what benefit can India derive from the Parliament or any legislative body? Nehru knew all these deficiencies of his own country, and that is why, he often had to play the role of a dictator even to the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha in order to carry out some important bill or resolution for the benefit and welfare of his country. Most members of the Parliament were not as much enlightened or liberal as Nehru in their outlook, and that is why, they often opposed him in many of his noble schemes and measures; that is why, he had often to be stiff, dogmatic and determined in over-riding all their opposition and carrying out his decision to the irresistible end for the benefit of the people of India. Otherwise Nehru was the most tolerant and compromising, most conciliating and cooperative in all his actions in private or public life.

No more of Feudalism, Favouritism, Nepotism, and Corruption :

Nehru being a thorough-bred democrat could not tolerate feudalism of any kind; and that is why, as soon as he became the Prime Minister of India, he liquidated all the Native States and the entire Zamindari system of our country which had been sapping the vitality of the Indian population for centuries particularly under the patronage of the British rule in India. The Britishers kept alive in our country more than six hundred Native States and thousands of Landlords, Taluqdars and Zamindars who helped to fill the British treasury with crores of rupees every year, and who in order to be in the good books of their masters (the British Lords) used to torture the poor tenants and the cultivators and make them bleed white in order to collect the revenue on behalf of the British Government in India. The Native Princes and the Landlords were a race of idlers, debauches and drunkards who were made worse so by the political agents of the British Government in India. Nehru felt that mere declaration of political independence in 1947 was no real attainment of independence unless and until the country became perfectly free from the hands of Princely Order of the Native States and the Princely masters of the Zamindari system. The result of the liquidation of the Native States and the abolition of the Zamindari system was that the position of the tenants and the cultivators particularly in the rural areas

greatly improved. The cultivators became the owners of the land which they cultivated for the purpose of growing food for themselves as well as for others. Nehru has done another great service to our country by initiating in the rural areas the old Panchayat system—a democratic replica of the court and the Parliament which decides or settles all sorts of disputes and quarrels among the rural people. That is how Nehru has proved himself to be an ideal democrat.

Further, during the British rule in India there was much of favouritism, nepotism and corruption in all departments and spheres of administration. As a matter of fact, whatever corruption we have in our country these days is nothing but the result of the British rule in India. Any fool or block-head could be a responsible government official and he could also have very quick lifts in his service by supersession if he knew only the art of lacing or unlacing the boots of his British master. Many of the Britishers, who came to India on Indian Civil Service, appointed many of the sons of their butlers or orderlies as Deputy Magistrates who became in the long run District Magistrates or Divisional Commissioners. Anybody who happened to help our old masters in fomenting the communal spirit and keeping alive the split between the Hindus and the Muslims used to be honoured with the titles of Rai Saheb, Rai Bahadur, Khan Saheb, Khan Bahadur, Dewan Saheb and Dewan Bahadur, and even sometimes with the most enviable titles of K.C.I.E. and K.C.S.I. which the Britishers used to award to the most honourable and most eminent personalities of their country. Then again, our old British masters used to encourage all sorts of vices and crimes, ofcourse, behind the screen and through the black sheep of our country in order to earn lakhs of rupees for themselves or their own country. Who has introduced the drink evil and the gambling habit into our country? Who has initiated us to tea and coffee, to the game of cards with heavy stakes just as they play at the Monte Carlo, the greatest gambling den in the world, in France? Drinking and gambling have now become fashionable habits under the seal of our old masters. We, Indian fools, know only how to imbibe the vices but not the virtues of other countries. Even these days, when we look at the dress of our men and women and also their style of living, who can say that we are Indians, and not apes

of the British juggler ? Even Nehru who was bred and brought up mostly in England used to put on his *kurta* and *pyjama* or his *achkan* and *pyjama* even when he used to go abroad. But just look at the young students and teachers of colleges or universities, or at the clerks in the various offices—government or private—, or look at the lawyers, physicians, businessmen or members of any other trade or profession or occupation. Ninety per cent of them go in trousers putting up the excuse that English dress is more durable, less expensive and even far more convenient than any kind of Indian dress such as *dhoti*, *pyjama*, *kurta* ! What an excuse and what a perversion of facts, and perversion of the mind too !

We have learnt corruption of every kind from the Britishers although the Britishers are not corrupt in themselves in their own country to the some degree as we are corrupt these days. Nehru was very much worried on this account but how could he reform the entire population over-night or even during the period of eighteen years of his regime ? Our corruption is too deep-rooted for various reasons. Poverty, vices, idleness, lack of discipline, want of vigilance, and a few others are the chief causes of our corruption. If we consider, on the one hand, the high cost of living, the shooting up of prices of the various essential commodities, while on the other, if we consider the low wages which the labourers in the workshops, factories, mills, or the clerks and the teachers in the government or private offices and in the educational institutions, receive per month, and also if we consider the number of members in each family to be fed, clothed, sheltered, and educated, we can not imagine how people with an average monthly income of one hundred to three hundred rupees are maintaining their existence. Then again, for want of sufficient number of houses in the towns or in the cities, the rent of even one room is so exorbitant that even those whose monthly income varies between one hundred and three hundred rupees and who have at least three or four members of each of their families, can never afford to engage even one room per family. Then again, due to hard work and poverty and also due to the miserable sanitation of most of our towns and cities, people suffer from various diseases, and consequently, they have to meet heavy bills on account of the medical aid they badly require for keeping alive or fit for their daily

routine of hard work. In addition to these indispensable expenses, everybody has to make sufficient provision for the education and marriage of his children. Education in India is now-a-days quite expensive, and regarding the marriage of girls, one has to go bankrupt in order to meet the dowry which is also quite enormous for the simple reason that most of the parents or guardians have to demand proportionate dowry from the bride's party in order to compensate the expenses incurred by the parents of sons on account of their education. But just consider the pitiable condition of the parents of daughters who have no sons, and who therefore have to pay a heavy dowry on the marriage of each daughter in spite of the fact that such parents have to spend equally on the education of their daughters just as the parents of sons have to spend on the education of their sons. How can all such peoples with so many heavy liabilities, exist in the world unless they earn extra money by some unfair means or other, as the railway goods clerks, petty station masters, ill-paid guards, engine-drivers and other such railway servants, or the clerks and other petty officers in the Public Works Department, in the Income Tax department, in the police service etc. generally do in our country? On the other hand, there is much of corruption at the higher levels where the big officers accept bribes, gratuities, donations, gifts, and so many other forms of illegal money sometimes to the tune of thousands and lakhs of rupees. They have absolutely no excuse or justification for earning such illegal money, cheating the government and the people only to feed their own lust for wealth or for indulging in all sorts of physical comforts and luxuries, and vulgar pleasures and vicious habits. In our opinion, these people should be severely punished—either flogged publicly or dismissed from their jobs and sent behind the bars for life or even shot down like dogs in the street. But can our Government afford to sack the biggest officers or send them behind the bars for life or confiscate all their ill-gotten money? Can our government afford to flog publicly or shoot down like dogs in the street the big contractors, financiers, and other business magnates who are the blackmarketeers, smugglers, and corruptors of the high government officials in most of the departments? If our government cannot take all these steps

for the eradication of corruption, we are afraid, corruption will stay for ever in our country.

When we consider the adulteration of food and medicine, we simply shudder at the criminals who actually are responsible for the slow-poisoning of the millions of lives in our country. Every body knows what injurious things are mixed with milk, butter, ghee, oil, and even with flour, and what poisonous ingredients are now-a-days being chemically mixed with the various patent medicines, and yet we have to use them all under a painful necessity. What happens to the consumers of all such stuff? Deterioration of health and premature death! These adulterators of food and medicine should be hanged without any mercy because they are no better criminals than murderers.

QUESTIONS

1. What is democracy?
 2. "Democracy like Communism has become the creed of opportunism, favouritism and back-door nepotism." Discuss.
 3. Differentiate between democracy and autocracy.
 4. Define Nehru's concept of democracy.
 5. In what sense Nehru was a true democrat?
 6. In spite of the spirit of freedom reigning everywhere, why are there so many military dictatorships in Pakistan, Burma, Egypt, China, and in many other small or big countries?
 7. "Communism is a form of mass slavery to the State." Discuss.
 8. Discuss the aim of democracy. How is it different from that of Communism?
 9. "Communism tries to kill the soul in man." Discuss.
 10. How did Nehru carry out his concept of the freedom of the press, speech and action into administration of India?
 11. Why is King the supreme temporal authority over British legislative bodies (the British Parliament)?
-

CHAPTER VII

NON-ALIGNMENT

What is non-alignment ?

Non-alignment is a foreign policy invented or formulated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the field of international politics with a view to prevent military alliances with the power blocs, which, according to Nehru, are secret designs for military aggression upon weaker countries and also for their exploitation. Nehru, when he noticed the tendency of the modern nations to align themselves in order to form power blocs, foresaw the danger of this tendency, and he foresaw in this tendency particularly the danger of producing conflicts between the nations or the countries instead of creating harmony and peace. Nehru thought that if the various nations remained non-aligned at least in their military relations or alliances, they would be able to carry on peacefully their development programmes and thereby enhance and quicken their material progress. America, for at least fifty years cut herself off from European politics *ie.* she followed a policy of non-alignment, and that is why, she was able to advance herself so much and so quickly in all fields of development and progress, particularly, in the fields of science, industries and technology. America is now-a-days the richest and also the most powerful country in the world. But then, unfortunately, America was drawn into the last two world wars, not by herself but by Great Britain who, for the first time, injected into the American national mind the virus of active interest in European or rather world politics, and along with it also the virus of ambition for a worldwide exploitation and supremacy which Great Britain had been actively pursuing for the past three or four centuries. Nehru very shrewdly noticed this great change in America, and he noticed further that Great Britain had initiated America to the idea of forming a world organisation like the United Nations in place of the

League of Nations which failed for various reasons in order to build up a mighty power bloc and to use it slowly and gradually for the purpose of extending British and American supremacy over the West and the East. That is exactly what the United Nations stands for although superficially speaking it has got its General Assembly and the Security Council with the ostensible programme of settling the various international disputes and problems, and also its another great branch known as the UNESCO, the ostensible aim of which is to develop and propagate ethical, scientific and cultural programmes among the member nations of this great world organisation known as the United Nations.

Nehru noticed also how Great Britain, after the liquidation of her empire in the East and the West, very cleverly manipulated some of the countries like Canada, Australia, India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Nepal and others in order to form another organisation (or power bloc) known as the Commonwealth of Nations in order to regain and reestablish the lost power and supremacy of Great Britain. Nehru noticed further that both America and Britain formed a few territorial defence organisations like CENTO, NATO, SEATO on the plea of preventing the possibilities of a world war again but the real intention behind all these military or defence organisation is nothing but curb the spread of Communism in the East or in the West. Communism has become such a bug-bear in the eyes of all western nations, and particularly, in the eyes of Great Britain and America that most of the Western nations are determined to fight to a finish any nuclear or full-fledged growth of communism in any part of the world, whether in Cuba or in Latin America, or in Algeria or in Cambodia or in Indonesia or in China or in Russia. Russia and China are now-a-days the biggest enemies in the eyes of Britain and America. Russia is more particularly considered as the deadliest enemy of America because Russia has taken the lead over America in nuclear armaments, while China is probably far more dreaded because of her mighty population and also because of the complete regimentation of her population for an all-out war against the capitalist countries.

Nehru noticed all these complications, and that is why, in order to save the world, not merely the East but also the

West, he formulated the most wonderful strategy of non-alignment. At the Bandung conference where many of the Afro-Asian countries assembled, Nehru explained the real implications of non-alignment in international politics, and he at once drew the most serious attention or consideration of the new political formula, not only by the smaller Afro-Asian countries but also by such great and powerful countries like Russia and China. China, unfortunately, for reasons best known to herself, dropped out altogether from her pledge to pursue non-alignment, but Russia is still sticking on to her pledge. Khrushchev used to appreciate very highly Nehru's two great formulae of Non-alignment and Co-existence. India has been consistently following the policy of non-alignment in spite of two treacherous attacks by Pakistan (in 1947 and 1965), and another treacherous attack by China in 1962. Pakistan is, however, thoroughly aligned with America and Britain although she recently threatened America to quit the United Nations unless she got the whole of Kashmir from India. Of course, Pakistan has no foreign policy at all except the policy of opportunism. It is really surprising how Britain and America can tolerate Pakistan as a member of the SEATO and the CENTO when particularly she has been caught red-handed in her collusion with China, the greatest enemy of America and Britain.

The Benefits of Non-alignment

The following are the benefits of Non-alignment : —

- (a) Friendliness to all nations and enmity from no nation.
- (b) Economic and other forms of aid from all countries without any political string.
- (c) No fear of military aggression except from a country which is basically mean, jealous and treacherous.
- (d) Peaceful development of national projects.

The chiefest benefit of non-alignment is that it does not inspire in any nation or country any kind of misunderstanding which is the real root of all quarrels between nations or countries. Non-alignment does not mean complete aloofness from

the world nations or countries, but it means, on the other hand, absolute non-interference with the affairs of any nation or country; it means further a kind of non-rivalry, non-competition which leads to no jealousy or misunderstanding or strife of any sort. A non-aligned country does not thrust any of her views or opinions or any other country in any of the international affairs; she does not take part in any of the domestic quarrels of any other country, and as such she is treated as a perfectly neutral country for all practical purposes; and that is why, she is actually friendly to all countries and inimical to none, on the basis of which she can expect atleast an attitude of apathy or indifference but not an attitude of enmity from any corner of the world. To be friendly to all countries, and not to be inimical to any country is a great advantage in the present-day world where there is so much of unfriendliness and enmity leading to frequent armed hostilities that disturb the peace and harmony of the entire human world.

If a country remains neutral or non-aligned, it has got the prospect of receiving all sorts of help in moments of need particularly for the development of various peaceful projects—scientific, industrial, agricultural, technological, educational or cultural. There are certain countries like America and Russia which are highly developed countries, and which, as such, can render a lot of financial aid as well as lend some kind of scientific, technological and industrial aid to any country which is a neutral country or atleast which is not aligned with any of the countries which is not inimical to either America or Russia. India being a non-aligned country has been able, during the last eighteen years ever since the attainment of her political independence, to secure a lot of financial and technical aid; and even during any year of the shortage of food due to drought or any other cause, India has been receiving a good supply of wheat and rice particularly from Canada, Australia and America. Pandit Nehru was really one of the most far-sighted and practically one of the wisest statesmen of the world, otherwise he could not have tided over so many of our national calamities chiefly the shortage of food and the need of arms and ammunition particularly at the time when China attacked India in 1962, particularly because India

is a non-aligned country. Even Russia supplied us some of the war material which we had to use against China when she had sprung a surprise attack on us. No communist country would like to help any one against another communist country, and yet Russia helped us a lot against China without attaching any political string to her aid, simply because Russia knows that India is a non-aligned or neutral country.

Normally speaking, a neutral country has no reason to fear any kind of aggression, and least of all, an armed aggression from any other country in the world. But then, both China and Pakistan have falsified that theory, not because it is a wrong theory but because both Pakistan and China are equally mean and treacherous. Pakistan on the pretext of the Kashmir dispute attacked us, while China on the pretext of the northern boundary question stole a march against us when we were least prepared for such a treacherous stab on our back. Pakistan, ofcourse, is jealous of India's progress and advancement in the development of her various projects, while China is jealous of India's enviable position or status in Asia next to Russia's position in the East, and consequently, China wants always to damage or cripple India by setting back her economy, her industrial development, and even to disgrace or humiliate her in the eyes of the Eastern hemisphere by occupying by force some portion of her Northern boundaries. But then, India has learnt a lesson both from Pakistan and China ; she is no longer unprepared in her defence but doubly prepared to meet both the treacherous countries in an open warfare provided they are ready to accept India's genuine challenge to them ; otherwise India, of herself, will never seek any armed clash with Pakistan who had been India's younger brother for several centuries before the Partition of our country. So far China is concerned, if inspite of India's friendliness to her, she (China) wants to quarrel or fight with a friendly and neutral neighbour, India is ready to meet her in the open field with all the tactics or strategies of Mao Tse-tung, China's misguided leader who has been digging the grave of China for the last three decades.

A non-aligned country, unless she is disturbed by such mean, jealous, and treacherous countries like Pakistan and China, can very nicely carry on her peaceful projects of

scientific, industrial and technological development as many of the countries in the East and the West had been doing so far before they ceased to be non-aligned countries. There are very few countries in the world which are equally developed or prosperous like America and Russia, hence, in order to maintain some amount of uniformity in the standard of material progress it is absolutely necessary that most of the backward and under-developed countries should remain perfectly non-aligned so long they do not come up to the level of advancement and progress of America or Russia. Nehru used to say that it is the duty of every mighty and powerful country to help every other small, weak and under-developed country, and not to hinder her progress any way just as China is doing one way, while America is doing another way, although the object of both is the same, namely, exploitation and expansion of power over the widest area on earth's surface. Nehru always used to say that unless and until the mightier nations are helpful to the weaker nations, there cannot be any progress, harmony or peace in the world. This is very very true. But who would listen to Nehru ?

Is Non-alignment Practicable ?

Nehru probably did not think of the wrong side of non-alignment. He had so much faith in non-alignment that he could never imagine how sometimes non-alignment is not workable or practicable. There are certain occasions when alignment is urgent and inevitable, for example, when a weak country is attacked by a powerful country how can she save herself without taking military aid from some other more powerful country ? Did not India seek the help of America, Britain and Russia when China made a surprise attack on her ? If America, Britain and Russia had not rushed arms and ammunition in October, 1962, we are sure, China would not have cried such an abrupt halt to her advancing aggression in NEFA or in Ladakh ; China would have positively taken an undue advantage of our unpreparedness and would have probably infiltrated further into our territory if some of the most powerful countries had not rushed their war material at the psychological moment. Does anybody mean to say that during that crisis India was non-aligned with Russia or America or Britain ? Then again, when India, during any year of an acute shortage of food, demands any

supply of wheat or rice from Canada or Australia or America, does it mean that India is not aligned with those countries? That is why, some of the critics of the policy of non-alignment say that non-alignment is a strategy of opportunism or the tactics of running with the hare and hunting with the hound. To be more practical and concrete in our estimate of non-alignment we should consider the position or attitude of any neighbouring country in the event of another world war, say, between China and U.S.A. Let us better take the case of India when caught in such a war; what should be the policy of India towards U.S.A. China and Russia? Can India remain completely non-aligned or neutral without lining up either with U.S.A. or with any of the two communist countries which are our nearest neighbours. If we align ourselves with U.S.A., both China and Russia will play havoc with us or U.S.A. and her chief ally Britain will try to devastate India as much as they can do. So, in any case of such a world crisis can India keep aloof from the devil and the deep? In our opinion, not only India but most under developed-countries shall have to line up with either U.S.A. and Britain or with Russia and China. Hence, non-alignment becomes absolutely meaningless or useless in the event of a world war. We have seen during the last two World Wars how the bigger and the smaller countries grouped themselves with one party or the other for self-preservation which is the strongest instinct of human nature and which always gets the precedence over all other instincts or impulses or decisions.

Then again, no country in the world can be so self-sufficient in every respect that she would require no help from any other country at a crisis. Why did America join hands with Britain or Russia sided with America and Britain during the World War of 1939? Why did Italy side with Germany? And why did Japan, a country of the Far East lined up with Germany and Italy? Why did France join hands with Britain against Germany? It was not a question of mere chance or whimsical preference; but it was a necessity out of either mutual proximity or mutual sympathy of the various member nations of the opposing power blocs which forced them to align themselves for or against one another. Many of the critics might

raise the pertinent question—what business either Japan or America had in the strife when the second world war like the first one was localised in Europe ? It was Britain that dragged America into the war everytime ; and so far Japan is concerned during the second World War, she became unduly powerful and ambitious due to her phenomenal developments in science, industries and technology. Besides, Japan like Germany became also unduly ambitious of power. Japan thought that she would become the sole master of the Far East because China or Russia was not then what they are now. America too indulged in the ambitious dream of being the master of the Pacific which she and Britain actually became atleast for some years after the termination of the hostilities so long Japan was under military occupation and Russia and China were just in the cradle of their military strength or power. During the last two decades Russia developed her nuclear power while China became highly militarised ; and hence, neither China nor Russia could curb the ambitions of Japan during nineteen thirties or forties. And so far America is concerned, Britain being the mother country for America, she would have and she actually did divide the spoils of the two World Wars between herself and America, and therefore, they reigned supreme over the Atlantic and the Pacific till nineteen forties.

Many other critics have raised the question of Nehru's non-alignment policy particularly in connection with India's joining the commonwealth of Nations and also the United Nations. They used to ask Nehru openly what kind of non-alignment was this membership of the two power blocs. Nehru said in reply that India had not entered into any military alliance or pact with any of these two groups just as Pakistan has done by being a member of the SEATO, NATO and CENTO all of which are territorial defence or organisations against China and Russia. Nehru was thoroughly honest in his own convictions, and he was also perfectly frank about them, not merely in preaching but also in practising them. He explained further his position that taking loans of food or of scientific and technical aid or even financial aid from any country does not mean any alignment with that country. Alignment actually means military alliance and not alliance in

trade or industries, in ethical or cultural missions. Nehru explained his position further before the world that India never accepted any kind of aid from any other country with any political string. Even at the present crisis of India when Pakistan and China are out to dislocate India's economy or paralyse or set back all her development projects, India is declaring very openly and honestly that she is not prepared to receive any kind of aid from Britain, America or Russia or any other country with any political string. Nehru's successor Shastri has made India's stand on Kashmir perfectly clear, and so, there is no room for misunderstanding on any body's part to indulge in wishful thinking as America and Britain might be thinking that India will yield to the question of Kashmir and also to a favourable settlement of the problem with Pakistan, while Russia and China might be speculating that India is now in a tight corner, and therefore, she must either yield to the proposal for the partition of Kashmir or for a complete surrender of Kashmir to Pakistan whether Kashmir has become an integral part of India or not. But the world should know that India will never agree to partition Kashmir or to surrender the entire State to Pakistan inspite of all temptations or threats from any corner of the world. India will always stand on her own legs and abide by the dictates of her own conscience.

QUESTIONS

1. What is non-alignment? Who invented or formulated this policy? What was the motive behind the formation of this policy?
 2. How America followed the policy of non-alignment? How did it affect her development and progress?
 3. Write a note on Nehru's two great formulae of "non-alignment" and "co-existence."
 4. What are the benefits of "non-alignment?"
 5. "Pandit Nehru was really one of the most far-sighted and practically one of the wisest statesmen of the world." Discuss
 6. "A neutral country has no reason to fear any kind of aggression." Discuss.
-

CHAPTER VIII

CO-EXISTENCE

What is Co-existence ?

Nehru again was the first to invent or formulate the principle of co-existence, which, ofcourse, is based on the well-known principle of 'live and let live'. This question of co-existence or of 'live and let live' did not arise during the pre-historic age of the human race because at that stage, man used to live in the jungles or mountain caves just like animals or wild beasts who used to live for themselves only, and not for the members of the fellow species. It was only when the human family or human society or community came into existence that man had to discover and lay down certain rules and principles inorder to make their collective existence possible; because man also like the beasts wanted to live for himself only, while staying in the family or in the society of other members of his species, he would naturally have to come into clash with other members and thereby lead to mutual destruction. Man, therefore, out of self-interest discovered and laid down the principle that every body should not only try to preserve himself but also allow others to preserve themselves so that all could live and carry on their respective affairs without any interference from any body. Co-existence or the principle of 'live and let live' is, therefore, absolutely a human principle, and it is based on a sense of justice, fairness, as well as on a feeling of love, sympathy, or friendliness which is a distinguishing quality of every human being unless, ofcourse, a human being degrades himself into a brute.

Nehru took the whole human race as one family, one society or one community, and not as different nations or races; and that is why, he thought of the welfare of the human race as a whole, and not in terms of any national or racial or Communal or sectarian interest. He felt like Gandhi, Christ, Buddha and other great humanitarians that if man

wanted to live on the surface of the earth, and if he wanted to distinguish himself from the beasts and the birds, he must live in full co-operation with his fellowmen, he must not unnecessarily interfere with the affairs of others, he must try to help others if he can afford to do so, and he should expect also that in his own hours of need, others also would help. This principle of co-existence is a kind of mutual exchange of help, sympathy and love as it is also an adjustment or distribution of mutual duties and rights or mutual demands and obligations. It is not a one-sided affair or bargain as it is so in the case of the animals and the birds and other species of living creatures that have no sense of duty or obligation to any of the members of its species but that has only the bodily urge or impulse to help itself against all others. To live for one self is indeed a selfish principle and it is not so much helpful even to self-preservation as the principle of co-existence is. The animals and the birds have no mind of the same type as human beings have; man can distinguish between what is good and bad for himself whereas birds and animals cannot do so; and that is why, it is man only who has discovered the various ways and means of self-preservation and also the preservation of his species. It is only when man forgets himself that he goes against his own species and destroys himself as well as his species.

Nehru found out during the last two world wars that it was only when man thought of himself only, his own interest, whether the interest of power or wealth, that man quarrels and goes to war with man. In Nehru's eyes all countries or nations are merely near or distant neighbours to one another. Nehru thought at the same time that if we have to be on good and friendly terms with our neighbours in villages, towns or cities, why should we not be the same to our neighbouring countries or nations, particularly when we know that they belong to the same human species as we ourselves do? But then, Nehru knew as much as we know that man often forgets himself, his humanity allowing the animality or the beastly nature in him to get hold of his entire self and thereby lead him to an armed conflict between himself and his brothers, his neighbours and all his other kith and kin some of whom may be known as Muslims or Hindus or Christians, or as Germans, Italians, Russians, Americans,

Chinese or Japanese. It is only the geographical boundaries which separate the various peoples, and it is these physical environments or barriers which have developed in mankind the spirit of distinction or difference due to which certain groups of our fellow beings feel that they are different creatures from ourselves although in reality there is absolutely no difference between them and ourselves even in one molecule or atom of our body or mind. Human beings all over the world think, feel imagine, act and do everything else all alike ; and hence, Nehru used to argue or question why should not all mankind feel like one family, one society, one brotherhood and help one another in moments of mutual need in order to preserve the human race in a state of health, harmony and happiness ? It is for this reason that Nehru formulated the principle of co-existence and desired not only his own countrymen but all mankind to observe this great principle which is at the root of every kind of progress, harmony and peace.

Is Co-existence possible without any interference with other Countries ?

In reply to this question Nehru used to say there is no question of interference with others if others do not work for themselves only, if others do not work for the evil of their fellowmen, if others do not consider their own interest as separate from that of his neighbours if others do not plot against the members of their own species as many people of the same family, the same society, and the same country plot for the injury and destruction of their own comrades, fellow workers, fellow citizens or fellow countrymen. The real question is not whether co-existence with or without interference is possible but whether coexistence is helpful or not to the health, prosperity and harmony or peace of the world. Nehru's reply in one word is that coexistence is not only helpful to the welfare of mankind but it is the only means of preserving the human race on earth.

Ofcourse, in every sphere of human activity there is bound to be some amount of difference in thinking as well as in doing things but that difference should not necessarily take the shape of a quarrel or strife or an armed conflict. In Nehru's opinion, as in our opinion too, all differences can be

resolved if every body remembers the fact that every body has to live in this world, and so long every body lives, it is his duty to see that his life is full of harmony and happiness, and not of quarrel and strife and enmity. Ofcourse, in the way of coexistence, the greatest obstacles are the baser instincts of human nature, namely, jealousy, spite, anger, selfishness, meanness, treachery, ambition, pride, arrogance and so many other evil qualities of man which prevent mankind from enjoying happiness or peace. If a member in a family wants to do something which other members do not like, it is the duty of the whole family to find out why a particular member wants to do something against the wishes of other members, and also to find out whether such an individual act on the part of one member is conducive to the welfare of the whole family or not. If the intended act is unwholesome or harmful, the first step to prevent it is to persuade and convince the member concerned about the undesirability of the act, and if the member concerned is not amenable to advice by all sorts of peaceful methods, he should be over-ruled by force, which means, in other words, that interference is necessary on certain occasions in order to maintain the equilibrium of co-existence. The law of co-existence is applicable to spheres—human or non-human. Nothing can exist in this universe if everything comes constantly into a clash with every thing else. The sun, the moon and the stars in space, the animals and birds and reptiles on land as well as the various creatures living under water would destroy one another in a moment if they did not obey the law of co-existence, which may be called, in other words, the law of gravitation which operates everywhere in this universe or multiverse. The law of co-existence, although based upon the sense of justice, equity and fairness which can be found only in mankind, is not a human but a law of Nature which is supreme over all other laws, and hence, if anybody goes to disobey it, he would positively invite nothing but destruction to himself as well as to others. What is War? It is nothing but a violation of the law of co-existence, and that is why, it is so destructive. Nehru wants that all the nations of the world should strictly observe the law of existence, and it is only then they can stop war and create peace and harmony in the human world. But can all the countries of the world be made to follow the principle of

co-existence or the maxim of 'live and let live,' particularly when human beings have in them so many opposing or militant qualities, and also when the spirit of nationalism is so strong and deep-rooted in every part of the world? How can mankind be made to believe that all nations, all races belong to the same stock and that they should have common interests and common points of agreement in every activity and in every mission? Nehru suggested a remedy. He said that if all nations agree to come under one world organisation, one world government, the law of co-existence can be observed or followed with ease. Nehru further said that when humanity is essentially the same all over the world, or in other words, when the human race has the same needs, same desires, same aspirations, same purposes, and even the same goal in life, why should there be any disagreement in any point of view? Why should not humanity feel, think and will in the same manner all over the world? We say in reply that if every body were to think, feel and will in the same way, human beings would all be converted into lifeless automatons or machines just as the people of the communist countries have been turned into mere machines or tools who have no independent will or desire or feeling or thought from what their dictators (*i.e.* their government) have taught them to have. In our opinion, the law of co-existence would be quite practicable provided all countries could be raised to the level of culture and enlightenment. But then, we find that it is the most cultured nations that provoke war, conflict and strife whenever they find that there are certain obstacles in their way of exploitation and tyranny which they want to exercise over the backward and unenlightened countries whether in the East or in the West. So, it is really very difficult to say how far the principle of co-existence will be successful in solving the various problems and disputes of the present-day world.

How far non-alignment is allied to co-existence ?

A country that believes in non-alignment must also believe in co-existence, although there may be certain instances of non-aligned countries that are indifferent to the law of co-existence. Russia, for example, is a non-aligned country like India; but does Russia follow the principle of co-existence also? If she

did so, she would not have exercised her influence over East Germany, Austria, Poland, Italy, Cuba, Latin America, India, and some parts of Africa and also some of the islands in South East Asia. China is also non-aligned in some ways and yet she is continually violating the law of co-existence in order to expand her power and supremacy not only in the East but also in the West. Ofcourse, Britain and America are neither non-aligned in any sense nor do they follow at all the policy of co-existence. Britain and America are most aligned always in peace or in war, and they being the most ambitious countries in the West can not be expected to follow the principle of co-existence however much they may talk about non-alignment, co-existence, freedom and peace. India is still non-aligned in the sense that she has not as yet entered into military alliance with any country in the world; and she will always follow the principle of co-existence chiefly because she is the home of spiritualism and idealistic philosophy. India's spiritualism and philosophy, according to certain critics, have been the chief cause of her downfall in the material world because India never attached any value to material progress or prosperity. She has been practising for centuries renunciation, asceticism, self-sacrifice, charity and all such things which do not fit into the modern materialistic world. That is why, India has been pushed into the background so far. But with the advent of English education, English culture, and also with the touch of Europe and America during the past five decades India is developing a materialistic mind, and consequently, she is also trying to advance her steps in science, industries and technology. After another five decades, who knows what attitude India will take towards non-alignment and coexistence ?

A country which does not believe in coexistence cannot believe in non-alignment ; but a country which believes in non-alignment may or may not believe in coexistence. A non-aligned country, so long she is not sufficiently advanced *i.e*; so long she is not self-sufficient or strong in all respects of national progress, will necessarily believe in co-existence; but no sooner than she feels that she can go without any other country's help or she is strong enough to interfere with the affairs of other countries, she is very likely to go against the law of coexistence because she will become ambitious of further power and

wealth and consequently, she will be out to encroach upon the lands and resources of other countries. That is how non-alignment and co-existence are correlated ; ofcourse, they are not basically opposed to each other. For example, so long China was a backward and weak country, she believed in alignment as well as in co-existence ; but now that she has grown considerably strong and self-sufficient, she does not care for alignment with the United Nations or with any particular country unless, that country plays the vassal to her. Then again, because of her militarised population and power, she is daily violating the law of coexistencce. because her aim is to spread her power or supremacy over Asia and even over the whole world. Britain or America has had no occasion to be either aligned or to believe in coexistence because each of them was and still is self-sufficient, and America particularly is the most prosperous and powerful country in the world ; and that is why, she is ambitious of conquering the whole world ; and that is why, she is always trying to fish in all troubled waters whether in Africa or in Europe or in Asia or anywhere else in the world. There are three major countries now, namely, America, Russia and China, which are ever ready to be aligned with any other powerful country and to violate the law of coexistence in any part of the world inorder to extend their power and supremacy. That is why, America has built up the United Nations Organisation, and that is why also Russia is a member of that Organisation although Russia and America are sworn enemies because Russia represents Communism while America represents Capitalism. But China inspite of her most vaulting ambition is not prepared to align with the United Nations probably because she wants to keep both of her hands perfectly free from any kind of obligation to any big country that may appear to be her rival. That is why, China inspite of being a communist country does not like to join hands with Russia which is also a communist country. She has further refused several times the offer of being a permanent member of the United Nations. But why ? Because she considers the United Nations a big trap for her in the sense that she will be bound down with certain rules of restriction which she is not prepared to obey. According to all political observers, China is feared to be the greatest breaker of the law of coexistence, and hence,

she is really the greatest menace to all free countries of the world. Russia is far more sober and also equally tactful or diplomatic in her measures which she has adopted so far to all the world nations, and that is why, she is suspected by China to be, not a friend, but an enemy to all communist countries. But in our opinion, Russia is soberly and scientifically communist, while China is fanatically and barbarously Communist. Now that America is draining out millions and billions of dollars for development of the backward countries, Communism probably will cease to exist because communism is a creed of poverty and it always flourishes in the soil of the poorer countries. China also will cease to believe in Communism when she will grow as rich or as advanced as Russia. Russia has already started veering round democracy, if not exactly round Capitalism. It is because of this great change in Russia, China has started in sheer despair to be frantically violent in all her programmes of spreading communism wherever the people are extremely poor and backward.

How Non-alignment and Co-existence are helpful to World Unity and World Peace.

In our opinion as also in the opinion of Nehru, non-alignment and coexistence are the best ways to world unity and world peace. Nehru has given the following arguments in favour of both non-alignment and co-existence :—

(1) A non-aligned country cannot generally have a declared enemy.

(2) A non-aligned country enjoys the confidence of most other countries.

(3) A non-aligned country does not ordinarily create any jealousy or suspicion of other countries.

(4) A non-aligned country can get all sorts of aid at a moment of emergency.

(5) A non-aligned country can carry on peacefully all her development projects.

(6) A non-aligned country commands greater confidence and respect from other countries.

(7) A non-aligned country can work as a mediator between other countries in settling certain disputes.

(8) A non-aligned country can help the cause of peace better than an aligned country.

(9) A country that does not believe in the law of co-existence is regarded as a great menace or enemy to mankind.

(10) Co-existence is the noblest doctrine of international politics.

(11) Without the law of co-existence nothing can exist in this universe of interrelated or correlated things.

(12) Co-existence is the primary law of existence, and herefore, it can never be disregarded without a heavy penalty which means annihilation.

(13) A country which practices co-existence is regarded as the greatest friend to humanity.

(14) A country that practises co-existence can alone bring about harmony and peace in the world.

(15) A country which practises both non-alignment and co-existence is an ideal country.

Ofcourse, a non-aligned country can have an enemy under cover or behind the screen just as India inspite of her declared non-alignment policy has incurred the malice and enmity of atleast two of her nearest neighbours—Pakistan and China, not because Pakistan and China have been offended by India any way but because both Pakistan and China are wicked, malicious and treacherous countries. Pakistan should know that China will never be a friend to her, and China should also know that Pakistan will betray China in the long run if she has not already betrayed her confidentially to America and Britain. India being a non-aligned country has friends practically in all countries of the world with a few exceptions which can never prove to be real friends to any country in the world. It is because of India's non-alignment policy that India has been getting such liberal aids from America, Britain, Russia and a few other countries whether in the form of food or money or technical knowledge and skill or even arms and ammunition.

India being a non-aligned country has not excited any jealousy in any other country except in Pakistan and China. India being a perfectly non-aligned or neutral country was carrying most peacefully all her development projects, and that is why, she has been able to make such phenomenal progress in all spheres during a short period of eighteen years only. But then, India's development projects, which are the real cause of envy or jealousy of Pakistan and China, will be seriously affected if Pakistan and China attack India again although they can never win the war against us, not because India is much stronger than Pakistan and China put together but because America and Russia will not allow India to be ruined particularly when India has been a friend to every country but enemy to none.

It is the privilege of a non-aligned country to command confidence and respect from other countries. Look at Pakistan—what a miserable status she has in the eyes of the world in spite of her membership of the United Nations Commonwealth of Nations, and so many other territorial defence organisations such as SEATO, NATO, CENIO and others. China's status is much higher than Pakistan's in the international sphere, not because she is not aligned with any other country but because she has some fixed policy or principle which she will never sacrifice even for any of the Communist countries, and least of all, for a buffer country like Pakistan. What a fool Pakistan has been playing in the hands of the Anglo-American bloc, and yet what has she been winning? Nothing except the dust from the boots of her British and American masters. She will be similarly treated by China also when China's design is fulfilled. All that Pakistan has gained is the unpopularity of her people—their curses for having involved them in an unprovoked war which has cost Pakistan so much of borrowed money and so much of gifted arms and ammunition, and above all, such a great set-back of economy and material progress. Pakistan by her unprovoked war against India has been pushed back at least for a decade in all development works; and if the people decide for a moment that they will take revenge upon the war-mongers, whether it is Ayub or Bhutto, Heaven alone knows whether Ayub and Bhutto shall have to fly away to

Peking for life though we know, Peking will not spare their lives, or the people of East Pakistan will rise in revolt and form an independent government at Dacca instead of acknowledging their allegiance to Rawalpindi or Karachi.

A non-aligned country can really help the cause of peace and harmony in the world for the simple reason that nobody can trust any aligned country whichever bloc she may belong to, whereas a non-aligned country inspires not only confidence and trust but also love and friendliness which are the prerequisites of peace and harmony in the human world. Every non-aligned country has a much greater chance than that of an aligned country to receive an invitation for settling certain disputes between other countries for the simple reason that a non-aligned country can always be an impartial judge and an unbiased arbitrator.

It is a fact that a country which practises non-alignment or coexistence is regarded as a friendly country without any doubt, and that is why, most of the nations listen to her counsel and allow themselves to be guided in domestic or in foreign affairs. The law of co-existence, being the primary law of existence, inspires the greatest influence upon the human mind, and as such, it is most helpful to the cause of peace and harmony in the world. Russia, atleast for the last one decade, has been preaching and probably practising also the law of co-existence, and that is why, she is being trusted by both India and Pakistan although Pakistan, really speaking, does not trust anybody, not even herself. If Pakistan could trust herself, there would not have been so many assassinations of her Presidents and Prime Ministers, so many changes in the Government, and so much of political disturbances within the State. Heaven alone knows where Ayub and Bhutto will land, and where East Pakistan will go. Will East Pakistan run away from West Pakistan or will she run into the arms of India just as Kashmir did in 1948?

Whoever cares for life, harmony and peace must also care for the law of co-existence without which there is no escape from annihilation.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the basic principle of co-existence?

2. Why the principle of co-existence is known as a human principle ?
3. On what qualities is the principle of co-existence based ?
4. "Nehru took the whole human race as one family, one society or one community."
Discuss Nehru's conception of one-world or one-Society.
5. "Nehru felt like Gandhi, Christ, Buddha and other great humanitarians."
Elucidate and amplify.
6. "This principle of co-existence is a kind of mutual exchange of help, sympathy and love as it is also an adjustment or distribution of mutual duties and rights or mutual demands and obligations."
Justify the above statement.
7. "It is only when man forgets himself that he goes against his own species and destroys himself as well as his species."
Explain and discuss.
8. "The principle of co-existence is at the root of every kind of progress, harmony and peace".
Discuss in relevance to world outlook the value of the principle.
9. "In the way of co-existence, the greatest obstacles are the baser instincts of human nature." Discuss.
10. The law of co-existence is applicable to all spheres—human or non-human". Discuss, how ?
11. What is the law of gravitation ? How is it akin to the law of co-existence ?
12. "What is war ? It is nothing but a violation of the law of co-existence." Discuss.
13. In the face of 'nationalism' strongly deep-rooted in world nations, is the law of co-existence workable ? Discuss, how ?
14. How can law of co-existence be well-followed by all world nations ? What remedy has Pandit Nehru suggested ?

15. How far non-alignment is allied to co-existence ?
 16. "India will always follow the principle of co-existence chiefly because she is the home of spiritualism and idealistic philosophy." Discuss.
 17. "America, Russia and China are ever ready to be aligned with any other powerful country and to violate the law of co-existence in any part of the world in order to extend their power and supremacy."
Discuss the truth of the remark.
 18. "Communism is a creed of poverty." Discuss.
 19. How Non-alignment and Co-existence are helpful to World Unity and World Peace ?
 20. Discuss the arguments brought forth by Nehru in favour of both non-alignment and co-existence.
 21. Discuss the advantages of being non-aligned in comparison to an aligned country.
-

CHAPTER IX

HOW BEST NEHRU'S GREAT IDEALS CAN BE FOLLOWED

Nehru was the first greatest disciple of Gandhi, and as such, like his Guru, Nehru practised always in his own whatever he said or preached before his countrymen. Whatever ideals Nehru has held up before us are not meant for India alone but for all other countries of the world. If the world desires to have any harmony or peace, it should pause and think seriously over all he has said and practised during his Prime Ministership of eighteen years which is a unique record of administration in the whole history of mankind. Whether the world has any regard or not for India or for Nehru, let it not neglect the greatest words of political wisdom Nehru has spoken and we have discussed in detail in this little volume of ours. Many political thinkers have either misunderstood or derided the great maxims of political wisdom Nehru has uttered but that does not cancel the truth of his great utterances. Whatever other political thinkers of the world may have to speak on some of the ideals of Nehru such as scientific approach to problems, or Secularism, or even democratic way of life, there cannot be any difference of opinion regarding national integration, non-alignment, coexistence, social justice and international understanding, all of which are most important and essential problems of the day which have got to be solved in the same manner and in no other way than Nehru has suggested to us. We want to put a question to the world nations—shall we go on avoiding these great problems just as we have been doing all these centuries, and invite thereby not only repeated wars in the human world at certain intervals ; or shall we put our heads together and join our hands too in the great campaign of liberating human slavery, human exploitation, human tyranny, human misery and human suffering ?

Nehru's non-alignment and coexistence are practically the same philosophy as Gandhi's Non-violence. Many people have derided Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence particularly in the modern materialistic world in which there is a cut-throat competition for the acquisition of power and wealth, and hence, to talk of non-violence in such a world is regarded as imbecility or madness. But if the world thinks for a moment why sometimes some of the nations propose for the banning of nuclear tests or for disarmament or for the organisation of a world government, why most of the nations of the world are often keen about world harmony and world peace, one can feel that Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence is not the philosophy of a mad man but, on the other hand, it is a very far-reaching and prophetic vision of the most effective strategy of preventing the spread of violence in the world. Gandhi used to say that violence breeds violence but non-violence neutralises or cures violence. Similarly, Nehru's philosophy of non-violence and coexistence is probably the most practical philosophy which is sure to prevent the recurrence of wars in the human world, to breed amity and harmony among the various nations of the world, to elevate mankind from the level of jealousy, meanness, rivalry ambition, lust for power and wealth, and other baser instincts and impulses which lead humanity to untold suffering and ruin.

Jesus Christ, Buddha and other great seers of the world spoke the very same things which Gandhi and Nehru have spoken. If the world attaches any value to the words of Buddha and Christ why should it not pause and think over what Gandhi and Nehru have spoken particularly when it has already seen how Gandhi and Nehru succeeded by means of their doctrines of non-violence, non-alignment and co-existence and brought about the liberation of India and also peace and harmony in India after centuries of unrest of Moghal, Pathan, and British rule. The world will not lose anything if it tries to apply or follow the great maxims or formulae of Nehru and Gandhi. If the world can try Marxism and Leninism for half a century and has also seen the result, why should it not try Gandhism and Nehruism for the same period particularly when the world knows that like Marxism and Leninism the doctrines of Nehru and Gandhi are not doctrines of war but of

peace. While Gandhi and Nehru were alive, the world should have awarded the Nobel prize to these great seers of our country. But then, unfortunately, there is politics even in the Nobel prize award Committee. Wherever there is politics, there can not be any fairness or justice. Ofcourse, Gandhi and Nehru would not have been more honoured by the award of the Nobel prize as they would be honoured if the world follows sincerely and without any national prejudice the philosophy of Gandhi and Nehru.

QUESTIONS

1. "Whatever ideals Nehru has held up before us are not meant for India alone but for all others countries of the world." Discuss.
2. "Nehru's administration is a unique record in the whole history of mankind." Discuss, how ?
3. What greatest words of political wisdom of Nehru have been discussed in this book ?
4. "Nehru's non-alignment and co-existence are practically the same philosophy as Gandhi's Non-violence." Discuss.
5. "Gandhi's philosophy of Non-violence is a very far-reaching and prophetic vision of the most effective strategy of preventing the spread of violence in the world." Discuss, how ?
6. "Violence breeds violence but non-violence neutralises or cures violence." Justify.
7. (a) What are the benefits of Nehru's philosophy of non-violence and co-existence ?
(b) How is it practicable ?
8. "Jesus Christ Buddha and other great seers of the world spoke the very same things which Gandhi and Nehru have spoken." Discuss.

— — — — —

